



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

JULY, 1908

MIŠNAIC HEBREW AND ITS RELATION TO BIBLICAL HEBREW AND TO ARAMAIC.

By Mišnaic Hebrew (MH.) we understand the idiom in which was composed the Halakic and Haggadic literature of the Jews from c. 200 B.C. to 200 A.C., i. e. from Simon the Just down to the first generation of the Amoraim. This literature comprises first and foremost the *Mišna* (edited in its present form c. 150 A.C.), and its companions the *Tosefta*, *Aboth d'R. Nathan* and the *Masektoth Ketanoth*; the *Midrašim*: *Mekilta*, *Sifra*, *Sifré* and *Seder 'Olam*; further, the Hebrew portions of the *Gemaroth* and of the exclusively Haggadic *Midrašim*, and a number of minor works which, though very late in their present forms, contain nevertheless elements which go back to the Mišnaic period. The term Mišna (משנה) used in this connexion must be understood in that wider sense which includes all the earlier Rabbinic literature as distinguished from the Scriptures (מקרא)¹. This name Mišnaic Hebrew is preferable to the term New Hebrew (*Neuhebräisch*) by which the idiom is commonly known. It has the merit of being free from any ambiguity. The latter is appropriate enough in relation to Biblical Hebrew (BH.), but it either ignores

¹ Cf. Bacher, *Terminologie*, p. 34 and n. 2, pp. 122 f., 194.

the later phases through which, after the Talmudic period, the Hebrew language passed, or confuses them¹ with that particular stage of its development with which we are now concerned.

Paitanic Hebrew², mediaeval Hebrew of the Hispano-Arabic school, and Modern Hebrew (beginning with R. Moses Haim Luzzatto, 1710-50)³ may have little or no value to the philological student as such⁴, but they are certainly not without their linguistic interest. In any case the existence of these idioms is a fact. To ignore them in studying the history of the Hebrew language would be unscientific. It is therefore important that every one of the varied idioms of the language at whatever period it appeared should be distinguished by an appropriate and precise designation.

The grammatical treatment of MH. has been scanty and fragmentary. The first pioneer work was Geiger's little *Lehrbuch*, which, in spite of many serious defects, still remains the best work on the subject. Unfortunately it does not go far enough. Leopold Dukes' book *Die Sprache der Mischna* (Esslingen, 1846) is of little value. Far better is Weiss's learned and suggestive work, *משפט לשון המשנה* (Vienna, 1867). But Weiss, eminent though he was as a Talmudist, was not a trained philologist or grammarian, and hence his judgment was not always what it should be, especially where he applied Rabbinical dialectics to the elucidation of questions of etymology. The arrangement of the work and its technical language is also crude and primitive. More methodical and fuller in the grammatical side is Siegfried and Strack's *NH. Grammatik*. But their work is vitiated by the admission of many Talmudic and even mediaeval forms, by the failure of the authors to distinguish between MH. and Aramaic or semi-Aramaic

¹ As is done by Siegfried and Strack in their *Grammatik*.

² Cf. Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie d. Mittelalters*, pp. 117 ff., 372 ff.

³ N. Slouschz, *La renaissance de la littérature hébraïque*, Paris, 1903.

⁴ Nöldeke, *Encyc. Brit.*⁹, vol. XXI, p. 646.

forms and phrases, and by a number of other inaccuracies. Useful material has also been collected by S. Stein in his dissertation *Das Verbum in der Mischnasprache* (Berlin, 1888) and by F. Hillel in *Nominalbildung in der Mischna* (Berlin, 1891). Scattered notices of MH. forms are also found in Barth's *Nominalbildung*.

On the lexical side, too, much still remains to be done. The elucidation and derivation of words have indeed been performed worthily and with adequacy in the well-known lexicons, notable among which are: Kohut's prolix but monumental edition of R. Nathan's *Aruch*, Jacob Levy's great and useful *NH. Wörterbuch*, and the more recent "Dictionary" by Marcus Jastrow¹ (the only work on the subject in the English language). But no systematic attempt has yet been made to distinguish the Hebraic elements in the vocabulary of MH. from the Aramaic and to trace their history and development both in form and meaning.

As to the nature of MH. and its connexion with BH. on the one side and with Aramaic on the other, great diversity of opinion prevails among scholars. Geiger² regards it as a purely artificial and mechanical creation of the Schoolmen, comparing it to the Latin of the Middle Ages. He goes so far as to trace some of its forms to false exegesis³. Siegfried and Strack hold the same view (p. 5), though they frequently point out the connexion of MH. forms with the corresponding forms in BH. Lector M. Friedmann holds that MH. is nothing but a Hebraized

¹ The services of this scholar to Semitic philology have not yet received the recognition which they richly deserve. For though many of his etymologies may be fanciful and far-fetched, he has nevertheless succeeded in restoring to the Semitic vocabulary a large number of words hitherto held to be of foreign derivation, and in the case of many others in at least reopening the question of their etymology for further discussion.

² So already Salomon Levysohn in his introductory essay מאמר על דקדוק לשון המשנה, printed in the Warsaw edition of the Mišna (1879).

³ Cf. his explanation of לֹא כִי, of אֲשֶׁה, of כִּדּוּר, p. 24.

Aramaic. According to his theory, MH. was, so to say, manufactured by the Rabbis after the fall of Bar Kokba, who for national and religious reasons had become hostile to Aramaic, now completely christianized; and in order to spread this new-fangled dialect among the people they had composed¹ in it Midrašic commentaries on the Bible, tales, legends, &c., thus creating the Rabbinic literature through which MH. gained currency among the mass of Jews (*Onkelos und Akylos*, Wien, 1896, p. 86 ff.). To this G. Dalman agrees, at least as far as the character of the idiom is concerned (*Gram. d. Jüd.-Pal. Aram.*, 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1905, p. 10, § 6).

Geiger's view is stoutly contested by Graetz (*Litteraturblatt d. Orients*, 1844, col. 824 ff.). He asserts that MH. was a living language spoken by the Jews in Hasmonean times, and that it was, moreover, the natural and direct development of BH. This, practically, is also the opinion of S. D. Luzzato (*ibid.*, 1846, col. 830 ff.) and of Jacob Levy who regards MH. as a popular and corrupted form of BH. (*ibid.*, 1844, col. 812)². The genuine character of MH. has been defended more recently by M. Israel Lévi who adduces the wealth of MH. words and expressions connected with secular occupations and with matters of general daily life as evidence of its having been the ordinary language of everyday life (*Ecclésiastique*, Introd., p. xxii). So also M. Grünbaum (*Z. D. M. G.*, XXXIX, p. 592 f., and *Sem. Studies in Memory of Kohut*, p. 232 f.), Dr. Wijnkoop (*J. Q. R.*, XV, p. 23 ff.), and Prof. W. Bacher in his article 'Hebrew Language' in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*.

Nöldeke seems to occupy an intermediate position. He holds that MH. was a genuine survival of classical Hebrew which, however, was preserved only artificially by the schoolmen whose ordinary and natural language was Aramaic (l. c., and *Die Semitischen Sprachen*, 2nd ed.,

¹ To be precise, one would have to add "and translated," as a great part of this literature originated much earlier than that age.

² Cf. also Maimonides to *Terumoth*, I, 1.

p. 21 f.). He is followed by Brockelmann in his new *Comparative Grammar*, p. 9 f.

On the other hand, Weiss (p. 2) grants that MH. was used as a medium of speech by the ordinary people, but nevertheless treats it almost throughout his book as an artificial scholastic idiom.

In order to facilitate its solution it will be useful to state the problem more fully and to indicate the real questions at issue. On perusing any ordinary chapter of the Mišna the reader is at once struck by many peculiarities in vocabulary, grammar, style, and diction. He will meet with a large number of words which are unknown in BH. but common in Aramaic. Again, a number of words which occur both in BH. and in Aram., but are used in the latter in a different sense, will be found in MH. in the Aram. sense. Many genuine BH. words are used in MH. in an entirely new connotation. The reader will also meet with a large number of technical words and phrases which are quite unknown in BH. Then as to grammar, he will find forms which in BH. occur but sporadically, and are therefore termed by grammarians "irregular," constituting in MH. the usual and normal type, and again forms and constructions which are entirely novel and without parallel in BH. but are common in Aramaic. The diction will appear as unlike ordinary Hebrew style as can be. Many familiar idioms and constructions, without which good Hebrew prose is inconceivable, are here entirely absent, while at every step the reader stumbles upon usages, phrases, and turns of speech which strike him as strange and almost barbarous. And yet he feels all the time that he is reading Hebrew and not Aramaic; that though the influence of the latter is perceptible at every step it is yet not the predominant factor, but is, on the contrary, everywhere subjected to the Hebrew and made to accommodate itself to it and to subserve it.

Now is this idiom a genuine and natural Hebrew speech only coloured and disfigured by Aram. influence, or is it

merely a mechanical and artificial mongrel production of Hebrew and Aram., combined in which Aram., though the natural and life-giving element, has been forcibly and mechanically subordinated to the artificial and lifeless Hebrew element? Would Hebrew, if left alone, have developed grammatically and syntactically on much the same lines as our MH. shows, and has the overpowering influence of Aram. merely intensified and hastened that development and in some cases directed it into certain channels; or would the development of Hebrew, if unchecked, never have been capable of proceeding on such lines as to produce something similar to MH., the latter therefore not being a genuine product of BH. but an artificial creation consisting of a clumsy intermixture of dead Hebrew with the living Aram., and which is neither the one nor the other? It is evident that these questions cannot be settled satisfactorily and scientifically except by a thoroughgoing study of the grammatical phenomena presented by MH., and by a comparison of these phenomena with the corresponding forms and constructions in BH., especially those of a later period, and also with those of Semitic languages other than Aramaic. It is only by such a method that we can ascertain whether the linguistic phenomena of MH. are natural to it or merely artificial; whether such peculiarities which it shares with Aram. are its own or merely borrowed from its more powerful rival. For the dissimilarity in style, however striking, between MH. and BH. cannot be adduced as evidence against the genuine Hebraic character of the Mišnaic idiom, any more than a similar dissimilarity existing between Old English, for example, and Modern English can be adduced against the claim of the latter to be the direct lineal descendant of the former; especially if we consider the profound and far-reaching differences in the surroundings and historical circumstances of the Jews of the Mišnaic period and those of Biblical times. Some part of this dissimilarity must also be ascribed to the general

differences in the character of the subjects treated of in the Bible and in the Mišna respectively. Nor should too much importance be attached to the differences in vocabulary between MH. and BH. Words, too, are subject to the inexorable laws which govern the existence of all organic beings. They, too, become old, often prematurely, and die without leaving any issue. They, too, are compelled to carry on an incessant struggle for existence in which the weaker go to the wall, and often disappear entirely without leaving any trace behind them. Moreover, new circumstances produce new needs and new ideas, and to express them new words and new phrases have to be created or borrowed. And owing to these causes, a more or less rapid change of vocabulary goes on continually in every living language. Such changes have taken place within BH. itself, and would have gone on on a more extensive scale in post-Biblical times even without the dominating influence of Aramaic.

But while individual words and phrases can be freely laid aside, borrowed or exchanged, grammatical forms and rules are not so easily and so freely manipulated. True, they, too, are subject to change, but the change must be natural, gradual, and imperceptible. For grammar is, as it were, the soul of the language, and by violently surrendering its grammar, the language would at the same time be giving up its very life and committing its own self-destruction. Change in grammar is usually a very slow and laborious process. The germ of the new form must have existed in the language long before the new form made its appearance. And when it does appear it remains for a time quiet and unobtrusive, and slowly and gradually works its way until it acquires a permanent place in the government of the language, existing for a long time side by side with the old form which it is eventually to supplant. And when the latter is compelled at last to acknowledge itself conquered, it does not yet yield up its position entirely but continues to exercise some kind of power,

however feeble and subordinate, until it is finally exterminated by its rival and disappears entirely.

It follows, therefore, that if MH. be a direct development of BH., its grammar will be found to coincide in its general characteristics with the grammar of the latter, while in certain particulars it will exhibit changes which it will be possible, to some extent at least, to trace to their BH. sources and to explain their growth by the general laws which regulate the development of Semitic grammar as exemplified in other Semitic dialects. The new forms will often agree with Aram., but this agreement will have to be capable of being accounted for partly by the close kinship which has ever existed between Hebrew and Aramaic, and which would lead to the same results being produced in the two languages under equal conditions, partly by the direct influence which a powerful and widely diffused language, such as Aram. was in the Mišnaic period, would naturally exercise upon a less powerful, though living and independent, neighbouring dialect.

On the other hand, if MH. is but an artificial creation of men who spoke Aram. as their natural language, its grammar would be bound to assume one of the following three forms: either it would be a painfully exact and pedantic copy of BH., or entirely an imitation of Aram. grammar, or, finally, a more or less skilful but mechanical and unnatural blending of the grammars of BH. and Aram., forming a sort of hotch-potch incapable of lending itself to rational explanation or to philological analysis.

In the following pages an attempt will be made to survey the leading characteristics of the grammar of MH., and to compare them, wherever possible, with the corresponding forms in BH., in Aram., and in other Semitic dialects, in order to ascertain the true nature of the dialect as revealed in its grammar and its relation to BH. and to Aramaic.

THE PRONOUN.

1. *Personal Pronoun.* The first person singular is in the Mišna and in other purely MH. works always אני and not אנכי. The latter is only found either in quotations from the Bible or in direct allusion to Biblical passages.

This exclusive use of אני MH. shares with later BH. Thus אנכי never occurs in the popular Song of Songs, in Lamentations, in Haggai, in Zachariah i-viii, in the semi-colloquial memoirs of Ezra, in Esther or in Koheleth, and only once in each of the following books: Ezekiel (xxxvi. 28 in a common and stereotyped phrase, cf. Jer. xi. 4, xxx. 22, &c.), Nehemiah (i. 6 in a prayer), Daniel (x. 11 in the words of the angel), and Chronicles (1 Chron. xvii. 1 from 2 Sam. vii. 2). Elsewhere the chronicler regularly substitutes אני for אנכי: contrast 1 Chron. xvii. 6 with 2 Sam. vii. 18; 1 Chron. xxi. 10, 17 with 2 Sam. xxiv. 12, 17; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 27 with 2 Kings xxii. 19. In the Pentateuch the portion assigned by critics to J and E show indeed a distinct preference for אנכי, but P uses אני almost exclusively¹. So also Aramaic (with the exception of the Zinjirli dialect)², Arabic and Ethiopic possess forms corresponding to אני only, while Assyrian, Moabitish and Phoenician use forms corresponding to אנכי only. In earlier Hebrew alone the two forms are found existing side by side, but אני being the shorter of the two, gradually came to be employed more frequently, especially in colloquial speech, until the longer form disappeared entirely from common use.

The *plural* is everywhere אני³. This form occurs, as is well known, only once in BH., and then only in the Kethîb

¹ Cf. Driver, *Introd. LOT*.⁶, p. 156 note, and the references to König.

² Cf. Cooke, *N. Sem. Inscr.*, Nos. 61, line 1 אנך; 62, l. 19 אנכי; but 63, l. 1, 20 אנח. The statement in the text does not, of course, imply that 'anî and 'anâ have a common origin; cf. Stade, *Hebr. Gr.*, § 179 a 2.

³ But in the earlier portions of the liturgy אנחנו is the regular form, cf. *The Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, edited by Rev. S. Singer, pp. 9, 51, &c., and contrast with the *Confession*, p. 262, &c.

(Jer. xlii. 6), which is rather remarkable, seeing that the Kethîb generally represents a more archaic type of the language. The word seems to be a popular formation of אַנִּי on the analogy of the plural forms of the pronominal suffixes קטלנו, קטלני, or of מַמְנִי, מַמְנִי; cf. also the verbal plurals קטלו, קטלו, &c., and the use of *u* in Assyrian as one of the plural terminations of nouns¹. From the vernacular the form crept into the book of Jeremiah, which was a great favourite with the popular reader, as witness the many interpolations and glosses found in it², but was struck out by the Massorah as a vulgarism.

All other Semitic languages have forms corresponding to אַנְחֵנו. So especially the Aram. dialects אַנְחֵנָא, אַנְחֵנָא, and in the latest and most debased dialects אַנְ, with the syncope of the inaudible guttural.

The pronoun for the second person masculine is in MH. אַתָּה, just as in BH. But אַתָּה for the masculine occurs in אַתָּה פָּתַח לוֹ (Passover Haggadah and in the parallels *Mekilta*, 13, 14; *Talm. j. Pesah.*, 10, § 4); אַתָּה קָבַדְרָא (*Sifrê*, Num. xi. 6; *Gen. rabba*, 2, 12), and more frequently in the late Haggadic Midrašim. This masculine use of אַתָּה is so rare and exceptional in earlier MH. that it can hardly be considered as evidence of a genuine modification of the established rule. אַתָּה must be regarded in such cases as having been borrowed directly from the Aramaic.

The occurrence of אַתָּה for the masc. in BH. (Num. xi. 15; Deut. v. 24; Ezek. xxviii. 14) is most probably due to a scribal oversight³.

In the plural אַתֵּן is sometimes found for אַתֶּם and הֵן for הֵם, but this is merely a phonetic change which is very common in MH., but which may partly be due to Aram. influence in which these pronouns end in ךְ.

2. *Demonstrative Pronoun.* The fem. sing. is usually הִיא.

¹ Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gr.*², p. 192 (5).

² Graetz, *Geschichte*, vol. II, part 2, p. 13, note 3.

³ Cf. the spelling אַתָּה 1 Sam. xxiv. 19, Ps. vi. 4, &c., and see Driver on Deut., l. c., and the *Oxford Heb. Lex.*, s. v.

In BH. the form occurs once in Hosea (ו, vii. 16) and in the cycle of N. Israelitish stories in the books of Kings (ו, 2 Kings vi. 19), both of which exhibit a number of dialectal peculiarities; further in Ezekiel (ו, xl. 45), who has several other neologisms, in a late psalm (ו, Ps. cxxxii. 12) and six times in Koheleth.

It is therefore very probable that the shorter form ו or וי existed from early times as a dialectal form in the northern speech, from which it gradually spread to the south, and in the course of time supplanted the longer form ואת.

The plural is אלו for אלה, which occurs also in Sirach (אלי, li. 24). The change of the second vowel must have been due to an unconscious desire to indicate more distinctly the plural character of the word. The vowel chosen is the same as in את discussed above.

MH. has also preserved the demonstrative use of the pronouns of the third person, e.g. *Sanh.*, III, 3 בזמן שאין להם אומנות אלא הוא "When they have no other trade but *that one*"; *B. Bathra*, V, 2 חמורך הוא "*that ass of thine*," as opposed to זה חמורך; so often הרי הוא, הרי היא, הרי הם, הרי הם, but more commonly with the article ההוא, ההם.

The stronger demonstr. הלו is found only in the shortened form הלו: *Tohoroth*, IV, 3; VI, 5 למקום הלו; VI, 8 "If he stands in *this* entrance (בפתח הזה) of the *basilica* and can see those who come in and go out through *that* (= the opposite) entrance (בפתח הלו)"; *Maccoth*, II, 2 הוציא הלו את ראשו "*that one* brought out his head¹."

The fem. הלו is found in *Yebamoth*, XIII, 2 ותצא הלו משום אחות אשה "that one goes forth² on account of her being the wife's sister."

The form הלה seems to be shortened from הלו with the apocope of the ל³. It has the same force as הלו but is only used substantively⁴: *Ma'as. Šeni*, III, 2 וזה אוכל פירותין בטהרה

¹ But the Cambridge codex (C) reads הלה. ² i.e. הוצאה, Deut. xxv. 5.

³ Cf. גמץ from גמץ (Koh. x. 8), and כיצר from כיצר.

⁴ Graetz, *Orient.*, 1845, col. 77.

וְהִלָּה עוֹשֶׂה צְרִכּוֹ בְּמַעֲוֹתָיו “*This one eats his fruits in purity and that one does what he requires with his money*”; *Nedarim*, IV, 8, V, 6; *B. Meṣiaʿ*, III, 2; *Sanh.*, VII, 10 (הִלָּה opposed to הָיָה); *ʿAboda Z.*, IV, 12. In *Yebam.*, III, 5 || *ʿEduyoth*, IV, 9 הִלָּה stands also for the feminine תִּצַּח הִלָּה אִשָּׁה¹.

The plural of הָלָה (= הָלוּהוּ) and of הִלָּלִי is הִלָּלוּ, evidently a contraction of הִלָּל + אֵלַי: *Ketuboth*, VII, 8 מוֹמֵן הִלָּלוּ “these defects,” and frequently.

MH. also uses the particle אֵת as a demonstr. The particle stands alone when introducing a clause, e. g. *Gittin*, IX, 5-7 אֵת שֶׁהָעֵדִים נִקְרְאוּ עִמּוֹ בִּשְׂרָר “That one with which the witnesses are read (i. e. which is immediately followed by the signatures of the witnesses) is valid.” *Ohol.*, II, 4 אֵת שֶׁהַגּוֹלֵל נִשְׁעַן עָלָיו “*That one* on which the *golel* is supported.” So especially to introduce two cases which either agree or differ from one another: *Berak.*, III, 1 אֵת שְׁלֹפְנֵי הַמִּטָּה וְאֵת שְׁלֹאֲחֵי הַמִּטָּה צוּרֵךְ בֵּהֶן פְּטוּרִין אֵת שֶׁאֵין לַמִּטָּה צוּרֵךְ בֵּהֶן חַיִּיבִין “Both of *those* before the bier and of *those* behind the bier: *those* of whom the bier has need are absolved, but *those* of whom the bier has no need are bound (to read the Šema’);” so *Šekalim*, VIII, 7; *Kin-nim*, III, 1, and, with omission of second אֵת, *Yadaim*, III, 1.

When introducing a noun the particle is followed by the pronom. suffix of the 3rd person in anticipation of the following noun², e. g. בְּאַחֲרֵי שָׁעָה “in *that* hour” (*Pea*, V, 4), יוֹם בְּאַחֲרֵי “in *that* day,” אִישׁוֹ “*that* man,” &c.³

The origin of this use of אֵת may be discovered probably

¹ Graetz’s suggestion (l. c.) to point the fem. הִלָּה is improbable. If this were so it would have been spelt הִלָּה just like הָלָה.

² Cf. below, p. 729 f. Literally the phrase means: “in its essence, namely, of the hour,” &c. (cf. *Ges.-Kautzsch*, p. 280, footnote 1), and is parallel to BH. הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה הוּא. Compare with the less emphatic בְּיָמָיו below, p. 730).

³ Cf. Weiss, p. 112. The remark of *Ges.-K.* (§ 117 i) concerning the MH. use of אֵת is incorrect.

in the peculiar usage found sporadically in all parts of the Bible, but more frequently in its later parts, of placing **את** before a noun, not necessarily in the accusative, in order to emphasize it or bring it out more prominently before the reader, thus imparting to the particle a semi-demonstrative force¹. Analogous to the MH. use of **את . . . את** may be mentioned Ezek. xxxv. 10 (emphatic "both . . . and"), xliii. 7; also Neh. ix. 19 and 2 Sam. v. 8.

The use of these demonstrative forms is peculiar to MH. and is unknown in Aramaic.

3. *Relative Pronoun.* The relative is in MH. everywhere **—שֶׁ**. **אֲשֶׁר** only occurs in the early liturgical language which is conceived in an elevated and semi-Biblical strain; thus in the Passover Haggadah . . . **אֲשֶׁר נִאֲלָנוּ וְנֵאֵל** (*Pesahim*, X, 6), in the Evening Service . . . **אֲשֶׁר בִּרְבֵּרוֹ** (Singer, op. cit., p. 96), and often in benedictions; so the formula **אֲשֶׁר קִדְּשָׁנוּ** **אֲשֶׁר בָּחַר בָּנוּ** (ibid., pp. 4, 124, 219, 274, 276, 278, &c.); **אֲשֶׁר יָצַר** (pp. 4, 230, 243); **אֲשֶׁר נָתַן** (pp. 5, 68); **אֲשֶׁר בָּרָא** (pp. 280, 299) and a few more. Elsewhere **—שֶׁ** is used: **שֶׁבָּכַל** (p. 51), **שִׁירָאֵת** (p. 239), and in benedictions (*Berak.*, VI, 3; VII, 3; IX, 1 ff.; Singer, pp. 5 f., 276, 290, 291, &c.).

In BH. the shorter form occurs twice in the Song of Deborah (**שֶׁשִּׁמְרָתִי**), a N. Israelitish production; three times in the story of Gideon—a N. Israelitish hero; once in the N. Israelitish section of the books of Kings; exclusively, except in the late superscription, in the collection of the popular songs known as Canticles, which originated most probably in N. Palestine²; sporadically in the later books and very frequently in *Koheleth* (cf. Ges.-K., § 36). Now whatever the relation of the two forms to each other, there is no doubt that **—שֶׁ** is as old, if not older than **אֲשֶׁר**. Its confinement in the earlier books to N. Israelitish

¹ Cf. Gesenius, *Lehrgebäude*, p. 683 f., König, *Syntax*, § 270 f. and the Oxford Lexicon, p. 85, 3.

² Driver, *Introd.*, p. 449.

documents proves, as Schröder¹ remarks, that its use must have been common in the vernacular speech of N. Palestine, under the influence, to some extent at least, of the Phoenician אש, ש, the Assyrian ša, and, perhaps, also the Aram. וי, רי. The scarcity of its occurrence even in these documents proves that it was regarded as a vulgarism which the literary language had to avoid. Its use gradually extended to S. Palestine, and being the shorter and more pliable form, it must in the course of time have entirely supplanted the longer form in the common language of the people, and from this it descended directly into MH. But the literary prejudice against it seems to have remained very strong, even long after BH. had ceased to be a living speech. This prejudice accounts for the non-occurrence of —שׁ in Esther, its scarcity in the Chronicles, and the anxiety to avoid it displayed occasionally even by a man of such an independent mind as the author of Kōheleth², not to mention such a studious imitator of the ancients as Sirach.

4. *Interrogative Pronoun.* By prefixing the interrog. particle אֵי to the demonstratives זֶה, זֶה MH. has formed a new interrog. adjective אֵיזֶה, fem. אֵיזִי “which?” It is often strengthened by the addition of the enclitic הוּא, הִיא and sometimes written as one word, אֵיזֶהוּ, אֵיזִיהִי, *Zebahim*, V, 1 אֵיזֶהוּ מִקוֹמָן שֶׁל זִבְחִים “which is the place of sacrifice?”; אֵיזִי הִיא דֶּרֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל “which is the right way?” *Aboth*, II, 1; *Kelim*, XVII, 6 אֵיזֶהוּ גִדּוּלָהּ, &c.

אֵיזֶה being practically one word, prepositions are attached to אֵי as באֵיזֶה, באֵיזִי, לאֵיזֶה, לאֵיזִי, &c.³

The plural of אֵיזֶה is אֵילָי of which only the following

¹ *Phoeniz. Sprache*, § 65 and footnote.

² Note such cumbrous and inconsistent phrases as בְּשֵׁל אִשְׁרֵי יַעֲקֹב, iii. 11, &c. (=Aram. . . . ברִּיל דִּי, viii. 17),

³ Cf. the phrase so common in the Halakic Midrašim נֶאֱמָר עַד “which side?” = how?, contracted usually in the Mišna and elsewhere, by the elimination of the זֶה, to כִּצֵּר. In the fragment of the Mišna with superlinear vocalization published by J. B. Markon (*Hakedem*, No. 1, St. Petersburg, 1907) the form is still written כִּצֵּר and כִּצֵּר, cf. the formation of הֵלָה from the original הִלָּה discussed above, p. 657.

examples have been discovered by the writer: *B. Mes.*, X, 1 רואים אלו האבנים הראויות להשתבר “They consider *which* are the stones which are likely to have been broken”; *Makširin*, III, 2 באלו משקין אמרו “In the case of *which* fluids have they said it?”¹ Possibly this plural may also be found in *B. Mes.*, II, 1 אלו מציאות שלו ואלו חייב להכריז “*Which* things when found are his (= the finder’s) and which is he bound to proclaim?” So D. Hoffmann in his translation and commentary. But the following resumption אלו מציאות שלו and § 3 ואלו חייב להכריז favour the rendering “*these*, &c.” also in the foregoing passage.

This אלו is a contraction of אלו + אי and perhaps ought to be spelt אילי, the defective spelling being due to the ignorance of the scribes, who mistook it for the demonstr. plural. The Rabbis, who had a passion for lucidity and precision, seem to have avoided this word for fear of this confusion with the demonstr., and hence its extreme rareness.

The composition and use of איזה is thoroughly Hebraic, and not as might perhaps be imagined an adaptation of the Aramaic אידן, אידא; rather may the latter be a translation of the MH. forms.

We have in BH. a number of passages by which we can trace the development of the phrase to its later sense. In אי זה בית הראה (1 Sam. ix. 18) the emphasis is on אי (= איזה), while זה serves merely as an enclitic particle to add strength and directness to the question², and the proper answer to the question would be הנה or פה בית הראה. So Isa. l. 1 אי זה ספר כריתות, and Jer. vi. 16 אי זה דרך הטוב ולכו בה, where it is to be noted that דרך, which is in the constr. state, is explicitly treated as fem. = ביה; so, probably, also Job xxxviii. 19 (bis), 24. Through constant use, however, of this interrog. combination the emphasis would in the course of time be sometimes shifted from אי to זה, especially as Hebrew words have a tendency of shifting forwards the accent, and the question would now be in the demonstr., the answer being

¹ The rendering “In the case of *these* fluids, &c.” would not accord with the usual interrogatory style of the Mišna.

² Cf. Ges.-K., § 136 c, d, and Burney’s Note on 1 Kings xiv. 6.

no longer הנה or פה but זה¹, while אי would be reduced to a mere interrogative particle as in איפה, איכה and MH. אימתי². This is the case in אי זה הדרך הלך (1 Kings xiii. 12) "*which* way did he go?"; הדרך being the direct object of הלך as in the following clause. If the question had been "*where* is the way in which he went?" the relative אשר, which is very rarely omitted in good prose, would have been inserted before הלך. So also 2 Kings iii. 8 אי זה הדרך נעלה "*which* way shall we go up?" as is shown by the answer: דרך מדבר אדום, and 2 Chron. xviii. 22 אי זה הדרך עבר³. In all these passages דרך is treated as masc., as sometimes elsewhere, or the phrase אי זה having become stereotyped is used without regard to the gender.

These two usages of אי זה must have existed side by side, influencing each other until finally the older sense disappeared and אי זה ceased to be an interrog. of place and became a pure interrog. pronoun or adjective. So in Koh. ii. 3, and especially in xi. 6, where it stands before a verb, אי זה יכשר. Though the two parts of the combination are still kept separate and distinct, the phrase is already indistinguishable from the MH. איזה.

An intermediate stage, where אי may bear both the meaning of "where?" and of the mere interrog. particle, is to be observed in cases where the phrase is combined with a preposition. Thus the question אי מזה באת (Gen. xvi. 8) presupposes the statement מזה באתי "from here (=this place) I come," and originally it must have meant, "Where is the מזה from which thou comest?" though as it stands אי hardly seems to be more than a mere sign of the interrogative. So Judg. xiii. 6, 1 Sam. xxv. 11 (a virtual question), 2 Sam. i. 3, 13, Job ii. 1, and in Jer. v. 2 אי לזאת תסלח לי, which presupposes the statement לזאת תסלח לי.

In 2 Sam. xv. 2 אי מזה עיר אתה, where the phrase is used without regard to the gender of the following noun, and in Jonah i. 8 ואי מזה עם אתה, we have the interrogative in its full MH. sense, except that the two parts remain separated with the preposition attached to the second component, while MH. would say: מאיזו עיר עם, מאיזה עיר⁴.

¹ Cf. Koh. xi. 6.

² Against Levy, *NHWB.*, s. v., cf. Payne-Smith, s. v. **אימתי**.

³ In the parallel account 1 Kings xxii. 24 הדרך seems to have fallen out.

⁴ Hence the rendering of the LXX: *ἐκ ποίας πόλεως* and *καὶ ἐκ ποίου λαοῦ*

5. *The Article.* The MH. article is identical with the BH. article both in form and in the general characteristics of its usage. Thus it is used whenever a noun is definite and known either from being definite in itself (e.g. החמה "the sun," השחר "the dawn," העולם "the world," השבת, &c.), or by having been mentioned before, or by being well known or necessary in connexion with the subject treated (e.g. נשאי הפֶּתָה "the bearers of the bier" in connexion with a dead body, *Berak.*, III, 1; מוֹחֵן אֶת הַכּוֹס "the cup is filled" (literally "mingled," in connexion with *Kidduš.*, VIII, 2)). The article is used with titles (e.g. המזונה "the overseer," *Yoma*, II, 1; הסֵּן "the deputy High Priest," VII, 1; אגריפוס המלך ¹ King Agrippa, *Bikkurim*, III, 4; יהודה הנשיא R. Juda the Prince (but בנה גדול and others)); with the vocative (e.g. המעון הזה "by this habitation!" *Ketub.*, II, 3; *Kerithoth*, VI, 3; המלך "O King!" *Sifre*, Deut. iii. 23, העבודה "by the Service!" &c.); with names of material (העץ "wood," *Šabb.*, II, 3; החסף, הוֹהֵב, *B. Meš.*, IV, 1); with collectives (e.g. הלוף והשום "Lof and garlic," &c., *Terumoth*, IX, 6); with abstracts (e.g. הניי והכח והעושר "beauty, strength, riches, glory, &c.," *Aboth*, VI, 8; *B. Meš.*, IV, 3, &c.).

The principle of using the article with nouns which are definite in the mind of the speaker² has found a much more extensive application in MH. than in BH. But it must be confessed that the article is used also in cases which cannot easily be brought under this heading, as e.g. הצואה "dirt," *Berak.*, III, 5; הצמר "wool," *Šabb.*, I, 6 and often. This must probably be ascribed to the influence of Aram., in which the emphatic state is so indiscriminately used even in those dialects which have still preserved the absolute state of most nouns. It must not, however, be

respectively. But אֵי מִדָּה, not followed by a noun, is rendered by the LXX by *πόθεν*: Gen. xvi. 8; Judg. xiii. 6; 1 Sam. xxv. 11; and 2 Sam. i. 3, 13. אֵי, however, the LXX always renders by *ποῖος*, except in Job xxxviii. 24.

¹ For the order, cf. Driver, *LOT*,⁶ p. 506, No. 11.

² Cf. Ges.-K., § 126 q-t, Driver on 1 Sam. i. 4; xix. 13.

supposed that MH. was becoming unconscious of the force and meaning of the article. On the contrary the emphatic and demonstrative force of the article in BH. has been strengthened and still further developed in MH., as will be evident from a consideration of the following idioms:—

(1) The article is regularly used with the participle in the sense of “he who . . .,” “she who . . .,” &c., especially in semi-conditional sentences, e. g. הקורא את שמע ולא השמיע לאוזניו “*He who reads the Šema’ but has not made his ears hear it,*” i. e. if one reads, &c., *Berak.*, II, 3; המתפלל וטעה “*He who prays and commits an error,*” i. e. if one prays, &c., V, 5; המוצא תפלין “*Erub.*, X, 1; החובל בחברו “*He who wounds his neighbour,*” *B. Kam.*, IX, 1, &c., &c. Contrast with *Exod.* xxi. 12 ומת איש מכה; *Prov.* xv. 32 . . . פורע מוסר מואם; *Koh.* x. 8 חופר גומץ בו יפל, &c.

(2) The article is prefixed to adjectives used substantively, i. e. when the nouns to which they refer are omitted. This omission is due to the laconic brevity and the parsimony in words which is one of the characteristics of Rabbinic diction, especially in the Halaka. The article in this instance serves to emphasize the nominal character of the adjective. In some cases it has a demonstr. force “that which.”

Demai, IX, 6 טול אתה הֶלֶח ואני את הַיָּבֵשׁ “Take thou the wet and I (take) the dry,” sc. הַיָּבֵשׁ mentioned before, or תבואה. *Terum.*, I, 5 . . . ולא מן הַתְּלוּשׁ על הַמְּחוּפֵּר . . . ולא מן הַחֶדֶשׁ . . . &c. “Neither from that which is loose upon that which is joined to the soil, &c.,” *ibid.*, I, 7, II, 6, IV, 8; *‘Erub.*, X, 11 (והמונה), *Megilla*, I, 11 and *Zebah.*, XIV, 6 בכל הרואה, sc. מקום “In every place which can see it,” viz. the High Place of Šiloh (an allusion to *Deut.* xii. 13 נותנין סודר ¹ (בכל מקום אשר תראה *Sanh.*, VII, 2). “A hard napkin is put into a soft one.” *Aboth*, II, 1 קשה לתוך הַרְפָּה מציזה קלה כְּבִהְמָנָה; II, 9 הנוֹלֵד sc. דבר *Menah.*, X, 2; *Hullin*, II, 6 השוחט המסוכנת “If one slays a beast afflicted with a fatal illness”; IV, 2 המבכרת (cf. *Bekor.*, III, 2); *Bekor.*, II, 6, 7 הוֹחֵלֵין (cf. *Kerith.*, VI, 6), VI, 4 והפנימיות; *Mikwaoth*, V, 5 מים sc. והנוטפין “those which trickle and those which drop,” i. e. water derived from a flowing stream and from rain respectively;

¹ Cf. also *Tosefta Pesah.*, III, 10; *R. Hašana*, 2 b.

VI, 3 השאוב sc. מקוה "A ritual bath filled with water drawn from another source."

In *Kidduš*, I, 4 for והדקה ought to be read ובהמה דקה "and small cattle," according to the Editio Princeps (Naples, 1492) and the Cambridge codex¹.

(3) In a number of passages, hardly exceeding forty in the whole Mišna, the attribute (an adjective, but more commonly a participle, active or passive) is found with the article, while the substantive is without the article, but in almost all these cases the attribute is more or less emphatic, limiting the range of the substantive or contrasting it with another substantive of a different character, and the article is thus often equivalent to introducing a qualifying relative clause. As is well known this construction is already found in a comparatively large number of Biblical passages², and in some of them a certain emphasis is to be observed in the attribute³, but many more "are hardly reducible to any rule⁴," and may therefore be regarded as colloquial irregularities which crept into the literary language. All the examples, however, in the Mišna, with hardly any exception, can be explained on the score of emphasis.

The following classification contains a fairly complete list of the passages in the Mišna with this construction:—

(1) When one attribute of the subst. is to be distinguished from another attribute of the same substantive expressed explicitly or implied: 'Erub., X, 11 והמינה בו נגר הנגר נועלים בו "A bolt *which* is dragged (on the ground by a string tied to the door) one may bolt with it in the sanctuary but not in the country, but (with a bolt) *which* lies loose it is prohibited both here and there."

¹ *The Mishna on which the Palestinian Talmud rests*, ed. by W. H. Lowe, Cambridge, 1883. In future these two texts will be quoted as N. and C. respectively.

² Ges.-K., § 126 *w*, *x*; Driver's *Tenses*³, § 209.

³ Ges.-K., l. c., letter *w*.

⁴ Driver, l. c. The expression איש הישראלי (Lev. xxiv. 10) may perhaps be due to the analogy of the preceding בני הישראלי. In לאיש העציר (2 Sam. xii. 4) a certain emphasis may be intended in the adject. as distinguished from the רש; so perhaps in Num. xxviii. 6, Judg. xvi. 27. In Zach. iv. 2 (note that הר הגורל is vocative) a ה has perhaps fallen out as the last word, ארה, ends with ה, and the substantive itself, הר, begins with ה.

Šabb., XIX, 5 קטן החולה “an infant who is ill,” opposed to an ordinary infant dealt with at the beginning of the section.

Beša, V, 3 כלים המיוחדים לאחד מן האחים “articles which are the special property of one of the brothers,” opposed to the following מיוחדים ושאינן.

Yebam., IV, 3 נכסים הנכנסים ויוצאים עמה “properties which come in and go out with her (= the wife),” i. e. נכסי מלוג¹ as opposed to ordinary נכסים or to נכסי צאן ברזל.

Ketub., VIII, 2 נכסים הידועים לבעל, opposed to the following ושאינן ידועים.

Ketub., VIII, 3 פירות התלושין מן הקרקע “fruits which have been plucked from the ground,” opposed to the following והמחוברין “those which are fixed to the ground.”

Ketub., XIII, 10 מוציאין מנוה הרע לנוה היפה אבל לא מנוה היפה “the husband may take his wife from a bad habitation to a fair one, but not *vice versa*.”

Sota, VII, 3 עניה האמורה להלן “the ‘answering’ spoken of there,” opposed to the following כאן (עניה האמורה).

B. Kam., I, 2 נכסים המיוחדים “property which is the special possession of some owner,” opposed to נכסי הפקר “unowned property².”

Ibid., רשות המיוחדת למזיק “a locality which belongs to the person causing the injury,” opposed to רשות הרבים “a public locality,” or to רשות הניזק “a locality belonging to the person injured³.”

B. Meš., II, 1 גיזי צמר הבאות ממדינתן “shorn wool which comes from the country,” opposed to הלכותות מבית האומן “those which have been brought from the mechanic,” *ibid.*, II, 2.

Aboth, V, 8 מיתות האמורות בתורה שלא נמסרו לב”ר “capital penalties which are enjoined by the Torah, but which are not in the power of the court of law to inflict,” opposed to capital penalties לב”ר נמסרו.

(2) When only one attribute is mentioned but with the chief stress laid upon the attribute and not upon the substantive, the article being still equivalent to a relative:—

¹ Cf. Levy, *NHWB.*, s. v. מלוג.

² Cf. the *Gemara*, fol. 13 b.

³ Cf. the preceding מִפְּנֵי.

'*Erub.*, IX, 4 גשרים המפולשים "bridges under which there is an open passage." So following למבוי המפולש.

Yebam., XII, 6 עצה ההוננת לו "a counsel which is suitable (= profitable) to him."

Aboth, I, 11 למקום מים הרעים "to a place of waters which are evil."

Hullin, IV, 1, 2, 4 בהמה המקשה לילד "a beast which has hard labour in bearing" (cf. Gen. xxxv. 17).

Ibid., IV, 7 נפש היפה "an appetite which is good."

Ibid., IX, 2 גמל הרכה "a tender (= young) camel, calf."

Arakim, IX, 7 כח היפה "the power which is good (= privilege)."

Kelim, II, 7 קלמרים המתואמות "a double (= twin) inkstand."

Chol., XVIII, 8 ועפר התיחוח "earth which is crushed."

(3) Some of these are standing expressions which have acquired almost a technical sense:—

Šekal., VI, 2 שער העליון "the Upper Gate," so Ezek. ix. 2.

Yoma, IV, 2, VI, 2 שעיר המשתלה "the goat which is to be sent away to Azazel," as opposed to שעיר החטאת.

Kidduš., II, 9 (and often) שור הנסקל "an ox condemned to stoning" (cf. Exod. xxi. 28, &c.).

B. Kam., I, 4 (&c.) שור המועד "the goring ox the owner of which has been forewarned¹," as opposed to שור תם.

Sanh., VII, 4 נערה המאורסה "a betrothed maiden" (cf. Exod. xxii. 25, 27).

Edwyoth, V, 6 שפחה המשוחררת "a manumitted female slave²."

Aboth, I, 1, 2 כנסת הגדולה "the Great Synagogue," as distinguished from an ordinary כנסת.

Ibid., II, 11 עין הרע ויצר הרע "an evil eye and evil inclination³," as opposed to עין טובה and יצר טוב⁴.

(4) Where the subst. is preceded by a preposition, the latter may be pointed with *pathaḥ*, or the expression is to be classed under the preceding headings:—

Pesah., VI, 5 לדבר האסור המותר; *B. Bathra*, X, 8 (end) בָּעוּף, הַגָּס, *Hullin*, III, 1 בָּפִי המתגבר, *Aboth*, II, 8 בָּפִיעִין הַנוֹבֵעַ, so *Aboth*, II, 8

¹ Cf. Exod. xxi. 29.

² C. reads משוחררת.

³ So עין הרע where עין and יצר are treated as masculine. So according to the traditional pronunciation עֵין, לֵשׁוֹן, as absolutes.

⁴ This last expression, not found in the Mišna, does not take the article at all. Cf. below, p. 669.

הרק ; *Kerith.*, III, 1 לקרבן הקל ; *Kelim*, VIII, 1 ; XXI, 1 ; בַּמֶּת הַחֲמֹר ; בְּפֹנֵי הַתַּחֲתֹן, בְּפֹנֵי הָעֶלְיוֹן.

In '*Erub.*, III, 6 יוֹמ־טוֹב הַסִּמּוּךְ, the compound יוֹט never takes the article ; so *Mikwa'oth*, III, 4 ; בעל־קרי החולה ; cf. below, p. 669.

On the other hand, cases are found in which the subst. has the article but not the attribute.

(1) *Pea*, VIII, 4 נֶאֱמָנִין עַל הַיָּרֵק חֵי וְאֵין נֶאֱמָנִין עַל הַמְבוּשֵׁל (the poor) are to be believed in the case of raw vegetables (if they declare it to have been given them as 'tithes of the poor,' but they are not to be believed in the case of cooked (vegetables). Here חֵי may be explained as accusative of state—"being raw". Cod. C. actually reads in the second clause עָלָיו מְבוּשֵׁל ; but the Munich cod. has הָחֵי².

Terum., VII, 3 הַמֵּאכִיל אֶת בְּנֵי קָטָנִים וְאֵת עֲבָדָיו בֵּין גְּדוּלִים וּבֵין קָטָנִים. Here, too, the adjective may be taken as acc. of state, "being young . . . whether young or grown up".

But this explanation can hardly apply to the following passages :—

Tamid, II, 4⁴ סִידֵר הַפְּעֻקָּה יְרוּלָה מִזְרַחָה "he laid in order the great pile (of wood on the altar) towards the east."

Ibid., II, 5 לְסִידֵר הַפְּעֻקָּה שְׁנִיָּהּ שֶׁל קִטְרֵת "to set in order the second pile for the frankincense."

Kelim, VIII, 10 הַכֵּנִים רָאִשׁוּ לְאוֹר הַתֵּנּוֹר טָהוֹר טָמֵא "if he caused his head to enter into the air space of a clean oven he has defiled it," and foll. הַכֵּנִים רָאִשׁוּ לְאוֹר הַתֵּנּוֹר טָמֵא נִטְמָא.

Para, XI, 2 כָּל הַפֶּפֶק טָהוֹר לְתִרּוּמָה טָהוֹר לְחִטָּאת "every doubtful case which would be clean in respect to *Teruma* is also clean in respect to the Red Heifer." Perhaps the article was omitted from the first טָהוֹר (attributive) by analogy of the second (predicative).

For חֲבִית מֶרְיָתָהּ (*Aboda*, IV, 10) cod. C. reads 'חֲבִית מֶר', while Munich cod. has 'הַח' הָמֶר.

¹ Cf. הוֹרֵעַ בְּשֹׁלֵה, Num. vi. 19, and see G. B. Gray, ad loc.

² Cf. Rabbinowicz, ספרים, דקדוקי.

³ But cf. *Talmud b. Ketub.*, 103 ב צריך אני צריך "I require my youngest son," and then צריך אני גדול.

⁴ This form with ה locale is only found here in the *Mišna* and in *Para*, XXXI, 8, both treatises belonging to the oldest strata of the *Mišna*, cf. D. Hoffmann, *Die erste Mischna*, pp. 18, 21.

For *הַפִּימִים שְׂאוּבִים* (*Temura*, I, 4) N. reads *הַפִּימִים הַשֵּׂא*, while C. has *מִימִים שְׂאוּבִים*.

Nega'im, X, 3 *מִיד הַשֵּׁעַר צָהוּב* (so N.), C. reads *שֵׁעַר צ'*. Note the following *שֵׁעַר צָהוּב*.

Cf. in BH. 1 Sam. xv. 9 (*הַמֶּלֶאכָה נִמְבֹּזָה*); 2 Sam. vi. 3; Jer. ii. 21, xxii. 6, xxiv. 2; Ezek. xxxix. 27; Esther ii. 14; Dan. viii. 13, xi. 31. After a suffix, Gen. xliii. 14; 2 Sam. xxii. 18 (*אֵיבִי עוֹן*); Ezek. xxxiv. 12; Ps. cxliii. 10¹.

(2) Sometimes the article is omitted with a demonstrative attribute, e.g. *Terum.*, III, 5 *זֶה הַכֹּרִי* "this heap of corn"; *Ketub.*, I, 8 *זֶה עוֹבֵר* "this embryo"; *Me'ila*, VI, 6 *זֶה הַבֵּיט* "this bag." In BH. this construction is found regularly when the subst. is determined by a suffix (e.g. *רִבְרִי אֵלָה*, Deut. xi. 18), and only occasionally, for the sake of euphony, when determined by the article². But in Moabitish and in Phoenician it seems to have been pretty common³.

The article is always omitted in a number of common expressions, specially compounds, which have become standing expressions, and as such are considered definite in themselves, e.g. *תְּלִמּוֹד תּוֹרָה* "the study of the Torah"; *דֶּרֶךְ אֲרֵץ* "good manners"; *סֵפֶר תּוֹרָה*, *עוֹבֵר זֶה* "this embryo"; *Me'ila*, VI, 6 *זֶה הַבֵּיט* "this bag." In BH. this construction is found regularly when the subst. is determined by a suffix (e.g. *רִבְרִי אֵלָה*, Deut. xi. 18), and only occasionally, for the sake of euphony, when determined by the article². But in Moabitish and in Phoenician it seems to have been pretty common³.

The article is always omitted with the genitive when introduced by *שֵׁל* and preceded by an anticipatory suffix (e.g. *Šabb.*, I, 1

¹ See König, *Syntax*, § 334 m, s, cf. also the omission of the article with the attribute of old proper names in BH., e.g. *זֶה הָרֶגֶל הַזֶּה*, 1 Kings ix. 17, &c.; but contrast ||2 Chron. viii. 5 *זֶה הָרֶגֶל הַזֶּה*, and 1 Chron. vii. 24. Cf. also the formula *יְרוּשָׁלַם קְדֻשָּׁה* on coins of Simon Maccabaeus, beside the more usual *הַקְדֻשָּׁה* (Madden, *Coins of the Jews*, p. 67 f.). In this case the article may have been omitted in order to save space. So in Syriac *ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ*, cf. Nöldeke, *Beiträge z. semit. Sprachwissenschaft*, p. 49, footnote 2; also *Syr. Gram.* (Engl. tr.), §§ 202, B. Rem., 203.

² Ges.-K., § 126 y, and *Tenses*, § 209.

³ Cf. Schröder, op. cit., §§ 43 (on *הוּא*), 58 and footnote, and 61; G. A. Cooke, *N. Semitic Inscriptions*, p. 26.

⁴ Contrast Ezra ix. 1 *עַיִן הָאֲרָצָה* in a different sense.

(יְדוּ שֶׁל עָנִי), of which more will be said below in the treatment of this construction¹.

Having now arrived at the conclusion of our survey of the MH. pronoun, we are in a position to affirm that as regards the pronoun, MH. stands wholly on the basis of BH., and that the few differences in forms and syntax between the two dialects are natural developments in MH. out of the older BH.; developments, moreover, which bear the stamp of a popular and almost colloquial character (cf., e. g., אֲנִי, אָלֹ, הִלֵּל, הִלְלִי, אַתָּה, &c.). The development and growth of the MH. pronoun have been seen to have proceeded gradually and uninterruptedly along the lines laid down by BH. and to have been hardly ever disturbed by Aramaic influence.

THE VERB.

The MH. verb, as is but natural, differs materially from the verb in classical Hebrew both in form and usage. Some old formations have almost disappeared (e. g. the Pu'al and the Po'el in verbs עָוָה), while many forms which appear in BH. as late and irregular neologisms have become here the normal type (e. g. the Nithpa'el; the new intensive forms of verbs עָוָה). A great many syntactical idioms which imparted such beauty and force to classical Hebrew style, are here entirely absent (e. g. the consecutive tenses, the variety of constructions with the infinitive); while, on the other hand, new constructions have arisen which were rare or unknown in BH. (e. g. the rise of a present tense in the participle, its use with הִיא, the periphrasis of the future by עָתִיד). Nevertheless, in spite of its great gains and still greater losses, the MH. verb, such as it is, is entirely indigenous and Hebraic. The Aram. influence which appears here and there, especially in the syntax, is not

¹ The frequent omission of the article in Sirach is probably to be ascribed to a studied imitation of the poetical and elevated style of BH. (cf. Ges.-K., § 126 h).

so intense or so general as might be supposed. Frequently this influence had already been active in Biblical times, and sometimes a form or usage which appears at first as an Aramaism, will be found on closer examination to be a feature common to many or all Semitic dialects in a later stage of their development. Such changes and differences manifested by MH. cannot therefore be ascribed, as they have been hitherto, to Aramaic influence, but must be explained as productions of the laws of growth and decay which govern all living languages in general and the Semitic family in particular.

We proceed to review the more prominent etymological and syntactical modifications exhibited by the MH. verb.

1. *The Stems.*

The *Kal* is identical both in form and meaning with BH. The form *Katēl* is exhibited by the verbs *בָּרַל*, *בָּטַל*, *בָּשַׁר*, *לָמַר*, &c. *Katol* is only found in the common verb *יָבֹל*.

The *Niph'al* also agrees practically with the Niph'al in BH. It is found in a *reflexive* sense. *לִיטָהַר* (= להטהר) "to purify oneself"; . . . נחלקו עליו "the sons of the High Priests divided themselves against him," i.e. disagreed with him (*Ketub.*, XIII, 1, 3); נמנו "they counted themselves" (*Šabb.*, I, 4); ונמיתו (*Pesah.*, IX, 11); היה נמנן "he would hide himself" (*Arakin*, IX, 4).

In a *middle* sense: נשאל "to inquire" (*Mo'ed Kat.*, III, 1); נפרעין "to obtain payment" (*Ab. Z.*, I, 1); נזכר "to recollect" (*Berak.*, III, 5; VIII, 7); נהנה "to enjoy" (*Aboth*, IV, 5, so *Sirach* xxx. 19); נמלך "to change one's mind¹."

More frequently as passive of *Kal*, נגמרו "they were completed," *Pea*, IV, 8; כל הנאכלין "all sacrifices which are eaten," &c., &c. Denominative Niph'al is found in יַעֲנִי "to become poor"; יַעֲשֶׁר "to become rich." *Šekal.*, III, 2 (but followed by העני, העשיר).

In חרש רומן ונרמז . . . קופץ ונקפץ "a deaf-mute makes sign (with his hand or head) and signs are made to him,

¹ Lit. "to obtain counsel for oneself," cf. *Neh.* v. 7.

.... makes signs with his mouth and signs with the mouth are made to him" (*Gittin*, V, 7); the Niph. is used loosely in order to preserve the personal construction with the subject which is a characteristic feature of Mišnaic style¹.

So the *Pi'el* is identical with the BH. *Pi'el* except that it is often spelt with *yod* after the short *hirek*. This, of course, is merely an orthographical device to facilitate the correct pronunciation and has no grammatical significance whatever². Cf. also the full spelling of the Pu'al (e.g. מְחַפֵּץ), of the Hoph'al (e.g. הוּחַר), and in nouns like אוֹכֵל, גִּירָן, &c.

The *Pi'el* is used in an *intensive* or *iterative* signification, e. g. מַפְסֵלִין "to trim, cut off twigs," *Šebi'ith*, II, 3; מְמַרְסִין "to mingle, stir" (*ibid.*, II, 10; cf. Ezek. xlv. 14); הַמְעַבְרִי "he who tans it"; הַמְחַתְכוֹ "he who cuts it up" (*Šabb.*, VII, 2); מְמַרְח "to smear" (*ibid.*, XXII, 3; cf. Isa. xxxviii. 21); הֵיוּ מְחַלְשֵׁין "they were plucking violently" (*Yoma*, VI, 4); וַיִּנְחָה (*Sanh.*, VII, 2); מַחְמַדְתָּן "coveteth them" (*Maccoth*, III, 15); הָרוּחַ מְנַשְׁבֵּת "the wind bloweth" (*Menahoth*, X, 4), &c.

Causative. סִילַק "to put aside"; מְחַפֵּץ "causing to be leavened" (*Orla*, II, 4); מְדַמְעֵ "causing to be mingled"; טַמֵּא "to defile"; עֲבָרָה "he caused her to be pregnant" (*Yebam.*, VII, 5; cf. Job xxi. 10); מִילְדִין "to help in child-bearing," so מִילְדָה "a midwife" (BH.); מְדַרְדִין "causing to walk" (*Šabb.*, XVIII, 2; cf. Ps. xlii. 5); לִשְׁכַּח "to cause to forget" (*Erub.*, VII, 9; cf. Lam. ii. 6); מְשַׁתְּקִין אֹזְנוֹ "they silence him" (*Sanh.*, V, 4), &c.

Denominative. מְזַבְלִין "to cover with manure" (> זבל); מְאֲבִקִין "to cover with dust"; מְעַשְׁנִין "to fumigate" (*Šebi'ith*, II, 2), often in a *privative* sense: מִיבְלִין "to remove wens"

¹ Cf. *Erub.*, IV, 10; *Mo'ed Kāṭ.*, III, 1, &c.

² So regularly in Aram. In MH. the full spelling is confined to certain types of texts. Stein's suggestion (*Das Verbum*, p. 31) that this spelling signifies a lengthening of the vowel consequent upon a dissolution of the doubling cannot, in view of these facts, be entertained at all.

(> יבלת, Lev. xxii. 22); מסקלין "to remove stones" (BH.); מורדין "to nip off shoots" (> ורר) (ibid., §§ 2, 3), &c.

Of the *Pu'al* only the participle is common, e. g. מחוּתָך "cut up"; מרובה "large"; מיופה "beautified, beautiful"; מבוּעַר "ugly"; מיוחד "specially belonging" or "unique"; מדומע "mingled" (of tithed fruit with untithed); מתופין "sour"; מעוברת "pregnant"; מאוּחַר "late"¹. But the other parts are extremely rare, the passive Nithpa'el being used in their place. The following instances only occur: לוקט "gathered" (*Pea*, V, 1); תעובר צורתו "let its form be made to pass away" (i. e. let the sacrifice be kept over the prescribed period and thus become liable to be burnt), a sacrificial technical expression. (*Pesah.*, VII, 9; *Šekal.*, VII, 3; *Zebah.*, VIII, 4); שינוגבו² "that they might become dry" (*Makširin*, V, 3); יחוננו, in elevated style (*Sota*, IX, 15, a later addition to the Mišna not found in N.), and חויבנו *Talmud b.*, *Makkoth*, 3 a. יופי (*Pea*, VI, 6), cited by Stein, is doubtful. C. reads יופי, N. יפי, Munich cod. ייפה. The parallel הורע proves nothing. In *Ketub.*, VIII, 4 יפה (so in all texts) is used as the opposite to הורע³. ויבוקש הרבר, in the historical *Baraita Talm. b. Kīddušin*, 66 a, is, as Stein (p. 12, n. 7) observes, a reminiscence of Esther ii. 23. In *Pesah.*, III, 1 point אלו עוברין "these pass away," sc. מן העולם, i. e. are destroyed⁴, and not as Weiss (p. 78) suggests עוברין which would involve an unnatural construction⁵.

The disappearance of the *Pu'al* and its replacement by the originally reflexive Nithpa'el is evidently due to the decay of the inflexional power of the language which was no longer capable of expressing the modification of the stem-idea by internal change alone without the aid of external additions to the stem⁶. The participle with its

¹ Hence probably מחוּתָך = מחר.

² N. reads שינוגבו, on which cf. Stein, p. 12.

³ Cf. also *Talm. b. Kīdd.*, 20 b; *Arakin*, 30 b.

⁴ Cf. *Aboth*, V, 21.

⁵ Cf. Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, 1867, p. 173, and Stein, l. c.

⁶ Cf. Geiger, *Lehrbuch*, § 15, 2.

firm preformative has been preserved, and even extended to newly acquired verbs; but the imperfect with its continually changing personal preformatives, and especially the perfect which had no preformatives at all, were no longer able to maintain themselves. This decaying tendency was already strong in BH., where the old passive of the *Kal* disappeared entirely, leaving behind only a few traces, and its place was taken by the reflexive *Niph'al*¹.

The same tendency was at work in all the other Semitic languages. In Assyrian² the reflexive stems were gradually supplanting the passives. In Ethiopic³, in Modern Arabic⁴ and, of course, in Aramaic⁵, all the passive forms have entirely disappeared and their place has been taken by the corresponding reflexives. MH., therefore, presents in the disappearance of the *Pu'al* a common Semitic phenomenon which, however, it confines to one stem only, while the other languages extended it to all the verbal stems⁶.

The *Hiph'il* is practically identical both in form and signification with the BH. *Hiph'il*. The Aram. א for the formative ה is only found in מה שאניתי "wherein thou hast cheated me" (= הוניתי, Exod. xxii. 30, &c.; cf. the verbal noun אונאה), *B. Mes.*, IV, 4⁷, but such Aramaisms already occur in BH., as אשכים (?), Jer. xxv. 3, and according to Barth (*Nominalbildung*, p. 73) also in אדוף, אדוף; cf. also the noun אונרה (cf. Ges.-K., § 63 *k, p*).

¹ Cf. Ges.-K., §§ 52 *e, s*, 53 *u*, and the ref. to Böttcher and Barth.

² Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gr.*², § 115, pp. 238-9.

³ Dillmann, *Ethiop. Gr.*², § 80.

⁴ Spitta-Bey, § 90 *a* (4).

⁵ With the exception of a few isolated forms in Biblical Aramaic and in some inscriptions, cf. Nöldeke, *GGA.*, 1884, p. 105; Wright, *Comp. Gr.*, p. 224 f.; Driver, *LOT*⁶, p. 504.

⁶ As might have been expected, the disuse of the *Pu'al* in MH. has also been laid to the door of Aram. influence, because, forsooth, the latter has no *Pu'al* (Stein, p. 11). But the Aram. contemporary with MH. has no *Hoph'al* either, and yet the *Hoph'al* is so abundant in MH.

⁷ C., however, reads שהוניתי. אכפה (*B. Mes.*, III, 7, IX, 4 and often in Talmud) cited by Siegfried and Strack is a purely Aram. form borrowed from the colloquial speech of the common people, and is, probably, not a verb at all.

As regards its meaning the Hiph'il occurs—

As *causative* very frequently: הקריש "to sanctify"; מקריא "to make to read—read to" (*Bikk.*, III, 7, &c.); מאחיין את האור "cause the fire to take hold (of the wood)¹=kindle," *Šabb.*, I, 11; XIV, 5; משהיטין את הטבח "cause the butcher to slay," *Hullin*, V, 4, &c. &c.

Denominative. התליע "to breed worms, decay"; figuratively, "spread like worms" (*Kilaim*, II, 3, also *Sirach* xxx. 13), and in a *privative* sense: "to remove worms" (*Middoth*, II, 5); הגריל "to cast lots" (*Yoma*, VI, 1); המגדיש "to pile up a stack" (*B. Kam.*, VI, 3); הרביש "to ferment" (of honey, *B. Meš.*, 38 a); המשליש "to deposit with a third party" (> שליש, *Ketub.*, VI, 7); האהיל "to overlay, cover," *Ohol.*, II, 1, &c.

Internal Hiph'il. This is even more common in MH. than in BH.: הוריקו "to become yellow" (*Šebi'ith*, VI, 3; *Ma'aseroth*, IV, 2, &c.); יבריא "to become healthy," *Šabb.*, XIX, 5; מִשְׁתַּגְדִּיל "after she will have grown up," *Ketub.*, VI, 6; והעשיר . . . והעני "he grew rich . . . poor" (*ibid.*); הבריקה "she became bright," euphemistically "blind" (*B. Meš.*, VI, 2); יחכים "grow wise," *B. Bathra*, X, 8; הקרים "to advance, be first"; הפליג, הרחק "to be far," &c., &c.

The *Hoph'al* is extremely common. It differs in no respect from the BH. *Hoph'al* except that it takes invariably the vowel *u* after the preformative, written —הו² instead of the usual BH. *hə*. This form of the vowel is found in BH. occasionally in the strong verbs (*Ges.-K.*, § 53 s) and regularly in most of the weak verbs (*viz.* ע"ו, פ"נ, ע"ע, and ל"א). As *u* is also the regular vowel of Pu'al, it became in the popular mind the *only* characteristic vowel of the passive stems, to the total suppression of the vowel *ə*.

The few relics of the *Hoph'al* in Aram. have *ə* after the

¹ Otherwise Jastrow. We should, probably, point אור (*Isa.* xxxi. 9, &c.), Aram. נור "a fire," and not according to traditional pronunciation אור.

² Cf. above (p. 672) on the spelling of the Pi'el. Stein cites one exception, *viz.* קְדוּחָה *Sifré*, *Deut.* iii. 23. His suggestion that קד is merely *hə* written *plene* is hardly probable.

preformative except in the weak verb; thus הִנַּחַת, הִתְנַחַת, but הִסְפַּח, הִסְפַּח; cf. Wright, *Comp. Gr.*, p. 225.

Hithpo'el and *Nithpa'el*. The reflexive of the intensive stem in MH. is, with few exceptions, *Nithpa'el* instead of the BH. *Hithpa'el*. Now these two formations are practically identical both in form and meaning, except that in the perfect the one has ה as its preformative and the other נ. There can, therefore, be no doubt whatever that the two form really one and the same stem¹. The preformative —ה was in the course of time changed in popular speech into —נ on the analogy of the *Niph'al*, through —ה becoming associated in the popular mind with the causative idea through the influence of *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*, and —נ with the reflexive idea through the influence of the *Niph'al*. This change only extended to the perfect, for in the imperf. there was no room for either of these preformatives, and in the infinitive and imperative the *Niph'al* itself has —ה, hence also the *Hithpa'el-Nithpa'el* has retained —ה (e. g. לְהַתְּנִיחַ, *Aboth*, IV, 5; לְהַתְּנִיחַ, V, 17; הַסְּתַכֵּל, III, 1, &c.). In the participle the preformative מ has maintained itself, in spite of the *Niph'al* participle נִסְתַּח, through its firmly established nominal force which is so universal in Semitic speech. Besides it would be unreasonable to expect that an analogy formation of this kind should be worked out to its full logical extreme.

This change of preformative must have begun at an early period in the popular idiom, hence its occurrence already in Deut. xxi. 9 and later in Ezek. xxiii. 48, where, it is to be noted, it has a passive signification. Gradually it made its way until in the *Mišna* the old form was almost entirely suppressed. The preformative —ה survives only in the old *Mišna*, *Bikk.*, III, 6²: וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה (perhaps only

¹ Contrast Geiger, § 15, and Siegf.-Strack, § 91, and compare Stein, p. 17. Salomon Levysohn (cf. above, p. 649, n. 2) explains the form *Nithpa'el* as an artificial composition of the *Niph'al* and the *Hithpa'el*.

² || *Sifré*, Deut. xxvi. Note the form שִׁירָיו and the general purity of style of this and the preceding sections. Cf. also Hoffmann, *Die erste Mischna*, p. 15 f.

a reminiscence of והשתחית, Deut. xxvi. 10); in the liturgical expression החפֿלל (*Ta'anith*, III, 8; old?) and in the legal phrase התקבלתי ממך מנה "I have received from thee a mina" (*Ketub.*, IX, 8). In V, 1, C. reads שנתקבלתי, while in N. it is missing; in 'A. Z., IV, 12, both C. and N. read שנתקבלתי, while ordinary edd. have התקבלתי.

The phonetic rules regulating the preformative ת are the same as in BH.; thus נשתתק "to become silent, dumb"; נשתתף "to join in partnership"; נסתמא "to become blind"; נצטרע "to become leprous." With first radical א the ת is changed into ד and transposed, as in Aram. (Dan. ii. 9): נזדמן "to chance"; נודעו "to be shaken violently"; להודיף "to be forged" (*Gittin*, II, 4).

Before the letters ט, ת, ה the ת is assimilated to the first radical, the short vowel being, however, often represented by a י as in Pi'el, e. g. שְׁנִידִיירָה "to be manured by cattle"; שְׁנִיפִיִיבָה "to be improved" (*Šebi'ith*, IV, 2); וּמִטְמָא בְנֵדָה "and he becometh defiled by a *Niddah*" (*Nidd.*, V, 5; but also מִתְמָא, *Nazir*, IV, 3. Cf. especially *Kelim*, II, 1); מִיתְרָגַם "to be translated." Cf. further, Stein, p. 19.

As regards its meaning, the Nithpa'el bears the same relation to the Pi'el as the Niph'al to the Qal. It is primarily *reflexive*, as נסתפג "to dry oneself"; נתעפס "to busy oneself"; נתודע "to make oneself known," &c.; or what may be termed *internally reflexive*: נסתבל "to look intently, consider" (= BH. התבונן); נשתדל "to endeavour, strive"; נתירא "to fear" (*Sota*, VII, 8, also Sirach iv. 36, xii. 11); מְהַנְדִּבִין שֶׁמֶן (*Zebah.*, X, 8; cf. Ezra iii. 5; 1 Chron. xxix. 17). Note especially נתפקה "to regain the sense of hearing and speech"; נתפתח "to regain the sense of sight"; נשתפה "to become sane"; נתחרש "to become deaf"; נסתמא "to become blind"; נשתמא "to become mad" (*Gittin*, II, 6); נשתתק "to become dumb" (*ibid.*, VII, 1). Also *reciprocal*: נשתתף "to join in partnership" (*Pea*, III, 5); נצטרף "to join one another" (*ibid.*, VI, 1); נתערב "to become mixed" (*Yebam.*, XI, 3). As *passive* it is very common, serving as a

substitute to the Pu'al, e. g. נתבשל, נתגלח, נתארכה, נתפתחה, &c., corresponding to the actives בשל, גלח, ארכ, פתח, &c.

This passive use of a reflexive stem is, as stated above (p. 674), common to all Semitic languages in their later phases, but in BH. it is only regular with the Niph'al, while in the Hithpa'el it is only found in וישחמר (Micah vi. 16), וישתכחו (Koh. viii. 10), and in the cases of Nithpa'el mentioned above (p. 676).

As in BH. and other Semitic languages¹ the reflexive idea is often expressed in MH. by periphrasis instead of the reflexive stems. This is especially the case with verbs which have no Nithpa'el. But instead of נפש, which is usual in BH. and Aram., MH. uses for this periphrasis the noun עצם ("bone," and in a derived sense, "substance, essence"), followed by the appropriate pronominal suffix, e. g. Kidduš, I, 1, קנה את עצמה "acquires herself"; so in the following sections; אין אדם משימ את עצמו רשע; "A man cannot make himself guilty," *Talm. b., Yebam.*, 25 b, &c.

This use of עצם is found already, in the construct state, in BH., but only in connexion with things, viz. בעצם היום הזה (Gen. vii. 13 and frequently); כעצם השמים (Exod. xxiv. 10) and בעצם חמו (Job xxi. 23). But it is obvious that the expression must have been primarily applied to animate beings and then figuratively also to inanimate beings, so that it must have been more commonly used in actual life than appears in the literary remains of old Hebrew.

עצם is also used generally in MH. as a reflexive pronoun, e. g. לעצמו (*Aboth*, I, 5); בעצמך (*ibid.*, II, 4); הוא עצמו "he himself"; זה בעצמו וזה בעצמו "this by itself and this by itself" = separately (*Šabb.*, XIX, 2); so לעצמה וזו לעצמה (*Pesah.*, I, 2). As a genitive עצם is equivalent to an emphatic pronominal suffix, e. g. בינו לבין עצמו "between him and his own person," i. e. privately (*Bikk.*, I, 4); על ידי עצמו "on his own behalf" (*Ketub.*, II, 9); מעשה עצמו "his own act," as opposed to מעשה שורו (*B. Kam.*, III, 9); דברים של עצמו "matters affecting himself,"

¹ Cf. Ges.-K., § 139f, s, and Wright, *Comp. Gr.*, p. 129.

opposed to דברים של אחרים (*Šebu'oth*, III, 5); "before thyself" (*Aboth*, II, 13); "by their own garment" (*Tamid*, I, 1); "through themselves" (*Para*, VIII, 11), &c.; cf. also the phrases לחוב בעצמך "to be guilty against thyself, thy life" (*Berak.*, I, 3), with מתחייב בנפשו (*Aboth*, III, 4, 7, 8); תמה עצמך "wonder in thyself" (*Makširin*, I, 3), with תמה בנפשך.

This use of עצם is an exclusively MH. idiom, and the late Aram. use of נרם in the same signification is an imitation of MH. (cf. also 2 Kings ix. 13 and see Burney's Note).

The old form *Saph'el* is found in the two verbs סרב (= סרהב) "to refuse, rebel¹" and סרגל (> רגל) "to rule, draw lines," and in the nouns סמרטוט (> מרט) "rag, lappet," and סרק (> ריק) "empty." The *Šaph'el* occurs only in the two very common verbs שעבד "to enslave, subdue," and שחרר "to liberate, manumit," and in the corresponding verbal nouns שעבוד, שחרור and also in שעמום "dullness" (> עמם, Ezek. xxviii. 3, &c.). These formations are found in all Semitic languages and also in BH.² The verbs שעבד and שחרר are, however, most probably loan-words from the Aramaic.

Like BH. and other Semitic languages³, MH. has formed a number of *quadriliterals*, but it does not exhibit in their formation that lack of restraint and of good taste which characterizes so many of the Aram. and especially Syriac formations⁴. They may be classified as follows:—

(1) Those formed by doubling the third radical: ערבב "to mingle"; שרטט "to scratch, inscribe"; קמצץ "to press."

(2) By repeating the whole root, only in ע"ע and ע"ו verbs: קלקל "to damage"; פרפר "to crumble"; סלסל "to curl, twist"; כלכל "to maintain"; נמנמ "to be drowsy."

(3) By inserting a ר after the first radical: קרצף "to scrape"; קרסם "to trim, gnaw" (= BH. כרסם, Ps. lxxx. 14); or adding a ר

¹ Also in Sirach, iv. 25 a, xli. 2, and probably also in BH. סרבים.

² Cf. Wright, *Comp. Gr.*, p. 204 f., Ges.-K., § 55 i.

³ Ges.-K., § 56; Wright, *Arab. Gr.*³, I, § 67; Spitta, § 89; Dillmann, *Eth. Gr.*², § 71 ff., and Wright, *Comp. Gr.*, p. 218 f.

⁴ Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*, § 180, and especially § 182; Dillmann, p. 251 f.

at the end: קנתר or קנטר "to chide" (> קנט); or a פרסם : מ (פרש) "to spread abroad, publish"; or a פרסם : ס "to move convulsively."

(4) Denominatives: נתאלמן or, after the Aram. fashion, נתארמל "to become a widow"; נתכרכם "to look saffron-like, abashed" (> כרכם, Cant. iv. 14); כרכב "to round off" (> כרכב, Exod. xxvii. 7, xxxviii. 4); משכן "to pledge" (> משכון)¹. Note also הלקט "to stuff birds," probably a Hiph'il, "to cause to pick up," but used as an independent verb — מהלקטין (Šabb., XXIV, 3). פרנס "to sustain"; קרסם "to scrape," and תרגם "to translate" (BH.) are most probably loan-words².

Most of these formations are also common in Aram. dialects, but in few, if in any, belongs the priority of formation to Aramaic. Some of them, like הלקט, כרכב, קרסם, קרצף are the exclusive possession of MH.

2. THE TENSES.

In the inflexion of the verb, the following variations from the BH. forms are found in MH. :—

The second masc. plural of the perfect sometimes ends in תן for תם (e.g. עשיתן, *Middoth*, II, 1; but עשיתם in *Aboth*, II, 3). This is usually ascribed to Aram. influence³. But may not this modification be due simply to the natural phonetic change of ם into ן? How liable older Hebrew was to make this change, and how anxious it was to avoid it, is shown by the fact that the tone was always placed on the syllables תם, תן, כם, כן, &c., in order, presumably, to ensure the distinct pronunciation of the final consonants, and to prevent their being confused with each other. Naturally this confusion which appears in MH. was facilitated and accelerated by contact with Aram., but it is difficult to believe that Aram. influence alone would have produced this change of letters if Hebrew itself had not shown a natural tendency in that direction. Aram. influence was incapable of remodelling in the least the

¹ An Assyrian word, Nöld., op. cit., § 181 (8).

² Cf., however, Jastrow, s. vv.

³ So Stein, p. 24.

inflexion of the Hebrew verb after its own manner. It could not produce a change in the vowel of this suffix from *ē* to *ū* and *é* (cf. MH. קטלָתֶם, קטלָתֶן with Aram. קטלתִין, קטלתֵין). Moreover, this influence, if it had really been so intense, ought to have worked in an opposite direction. Instead of producing in MH. one form for both genders, it ought to have preserved and accentuated in MH. the differences and distinction between the genders and persons of which Aramaic itself is so jealous, while Hebrew had always been slack about them, as is shown by the common gender of קטלו (Aram. קטלו m.; קטלא, קטלי f.), and the use of תקטלנה for the second and third fem. plural (Aram. תקטלן, יקטלן or נקטלן respectively).

In the imperfect the form תקטלנה has entirely disappeared without leaving any trace in the whole of the vast MH. literature¹. יקטלו and תקטלו are therefore used for both genders just like קטלו already in BH. and קטלתן sometimes in MH. In this MH. has merely developed to the full a tendency already strong in BH. (cf. Gen. xxx. 39; Lev. xxvi. 33 b; Judges xxi. 21 a, &c.; Ges.-K., § 145 *p, t, u*). Modern Arabic has gone further in this respect than MH., inasmuch as it has given up all the fem. plural forms, whether in the perfect or in the imperfect². Aramaic, however, has anxiously preserved the distinction of gender even in the latest and most decayed dialects³.

The imperfect *Ḳal* of transitive verbs is, in accordance with the general rules of spelling in MH., written plene יקטול. The plural remains יקטלו even at the end of a sentence. In a few instances, however, the form יקטולו is found in pause: *Tohor.*, X, 3 עד שיטבולו "until they bathe"; *Mikwaoth*, I, 5 וישטופו "and they will overflow"; *Uḡsin*, III, 4 עד שימתיקו "until they become sweet"; ויהלוקו "and

¹ The form יקטלנה in the 18 (19) benedictions (Singer, p. 51), is an adaptation of Isa. xxxiii. 17 and Ps. xvii. 2.

² Spitta, § 90 a (1).

³ Mandaic forms an exception, as it uses sometimes the masc. for the fem.; cf. Nöldeke, *Mand. Gr.*, § 162, and p. 87 (top).

they shall divide" (*B. Mes.*, I, 1, 2, &c.), the latter also without pause in *Ketub.*, VIII, 2. So שימחונו "that they may become softened" (*Tohor.*, IX, 5), and the fem. sing. שחרורי "which thou wilt vow" (*Nedarim*, X, 7), which Stein (p. 30) ascribes to Syriac influence¹.

So also in the imperative in pause כתובי "write ye!"; החתום "seal ye!" *Gittin*, VI, 7; VII, 2.

The *consecutive tenses* have practically² disappeared altogether in MH. They are not even found in the liturgy except in a few isolated cases, viz. in the *Ahaba*, שבטחו ותלפידם בך ותלפידם (Singer, p. 39), but it may be doubted whether this phrase existed in the benediction in Mišnaic times³; in the formula for the sanctification of the festivals: ותקן לנו (Singer, pp. 228, 230, &c.); in the *Habdala*: ותבדיל, ותלפידנו, &c. (*ibid.*, pp. 46, 227, 240, six times beside one perf. with simple *waw*); in the Service for the New Year: ותפקדהו (p. 250), ותשמיצם . . . בהגלותך (p. 252); in the Ne'ila for the Day of Atonement: ותלפידנו ותפירהו (p. 267). These instances must be ascribed to the influence of Biblical style which manifested itself only in elevated and semi-poetical passages. They are not deliberate imitations of the old literary style, nor are they derived from the living speech of the day; for in either case they would have occurred more frequently.

As is well known, numerous passages are found even in the oldest portions of the Bible in which the simple tenses are used in place of the usual consecutive tenses, and this becomes more frequent from the times of Jeremiah onward, until in Koheleth the relation between the consecutive and

¹ In *Megillah*, III, 3, the ordinary reading לא יחלוש is correct. יחלושו could hardly be used in an impersonal sense (against Stein, l. c.).

² The only passage known to the writer where the consec. tenses are found is the remarkable *Baraita* in *Talm. b. Kidduš.*, 66 a, in which the impf. consec. occurs seven times (three of which are the form ויאמר), beside eleven times of the perf. with weak *waw*. This *Baraita* seems to be a fragment of a collection of historical tales written in MH. but affecting to imitate the old historical style.

³ Cf. *Berak.*, I, 4. The phrase in the *Geulla*, ויבסו מים צריהם (Singer, p. 43), is of course a quotation from Ps. cvi. 11.

the simple tenses is reversed, i. e. the use of the simple tense becomes regular while that of the consecutive tense becomes exceptional. The explanation of this phenomenon as due to Aramaic influence, though obvious and plausible, is inapplicable to the cases in the earlier books (cf. Driver's *Tenses*, § 133). It remains, therefore, to say that this irregularity arose at an early time within the Hebrew language itself and independently of outside influence. For it is inconceivable that in ordinary colloquial Hebrew, even of the golden age of the language, such a subtle and complicated idiom as the use of the consecutive tenses could have always been observed with the strict precision which we generally find in the literary dialect. The popular speaker could not always have been equal to the mental strain involved in the regular and continuous use of a construction of this nature. Now and again looseness of thought would manifest itself in loose and irregular constructions, and these would in due time find their way into the literature, and what was first a vulgarism would in the course of time become merely a permissible and innocent irregularity of style, and later a regular alternative construction, until finally it would become the acceptedly natural and regular mode of expression.

It may even be doubted whether the consecutive construction ever attained in popular speech that dominating position which it occupies in the literary dialect, and whether the more original and more convenient construction with the simple tenses did not survive in the everyday language side by side with the new and more elegant construction by means of the consecutive tenses. In Phoenician, which also possesses the consecutive tenses, the simple tenses are used very often where BH. would employ the consecutive; thus *ישמע . . . ופעל* (Cooke, *N. Sem. Inscr.*, No. 3, l. 8); *ופעלת אנך ויקרשית* (No. 29, l. 13); *בן . . . ופעל* (No. 33, l. 3); *פעל ותרש* (No. 38, l. 1), and the common phrase *יתן ויטנא* (No. 13, l. 2, &c.), both verbs of which are perfects.

The contact with Aram. would, naturally, but strengthen the position of the older construction until finally the consecutive tenses would be entirely banished from the living language and survive only in literature largely by force of the literary tradition, as in *Koheleth*, *Daniel*, &c., or through conscious and deliberate imitation of older models; so in *Esther*, *Chronicles*, and in *Sirach*. If this be the case, the consecutive tenses must have become obsolete in the living language long before the close of the Canon.

3. THE INFINITIVE.

Of the various and manifold constructions with the infinitive to be found in BH., MH. has only retained the gerundial use with ל to express the motion, direction, and purpose of a verb. In its nominal capacity the infin. has been supplanted in MH. by the corresponding verbal nouns which are so numerous in MH., while for the infin. with the prepositions ב, כ, periphrasis with —כִּשְׁ (= BH. בִּישָׁר, Aram. כְּרִי, Dan. vi. 10, כִּר) has been substituted as in Syriac and usually in Aramaic. The loss of these constructions cannot be ascribed to Aram. influence, since in Aram. the infinitival construction is to be found pretty often, at least in the Targumim, e. g. בְּמִיתָא (Gen. xlviii. 7), בְּמַפְקִיָּה (xii. 4), בְּמִתְחִיָּה (xxiv. 61), בְּמַפְקִי (Exod. ix. 29), בְּשִׁלְחוֹתֶיהָ (xi. 1), &c., &c. These Aram. forms may, of course, be due to the influence of the Hebrew text; but the fact remains that they were permissible in Aram. and not in MH. Moreover, the infin. absolute for emphasizing a following finite verb is extremely common, not only in the Targumim but also in Syriac¹, while not a trace of it is to be found in MH. The loss of the infinitive must therefore be due to natural decay. And in fact in those late books of the Bible which have not been influenced consciously or unconsciously by

¹ Cf. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*, § 293 ff. In the Targumim the inf. absol. is used almost always where the Hebrew text has is. Cf. also Winer's *Chald. Gr.*³ (1882), § 46, 4, 5.

earlier models the use of the infin. is much more scarce than in earlier books. Thus in Nehemiah's Memoirs the inf. with כ is only found once, כשמעי (i. 4); contrast with כ אשר שמע (iii. 33, iv. 1, 9), כ אשר באו (iv. 6), כ אשר נבנתה (vii. 1), &c. In Koheleth the infin. with ל is extremely common, just as in MH., while the other infinitival constructions are extremely rare. The only real infinitives in the book are ברבות (v. 10) and בשפל (xii. 4), since ברוב (i. 18, v. 2, 6, xi. 1), מלא (iv. 6)¹, and ברוע (vii. 3) are properly substantives. Contrast, on the other hand, לא ימצא (iii. 11), כ אשר תלך (iv. 17), כ אשר יהיה (viii. 7), also iv. 10-12, &c., where older Hebrew would certainly have preferred the infinitival construction. So also in the book of Canticles, the inf. with ל alone is found (vi. 2, 11), but not with ב or כ. Note the construction in viii. 1, 6, 8, and other places where literary Hebrew would have certainly used the infinitive. This construction of the infin. with ב or כ is also absent in the first chapter of Daniel, while from the clumsy way in which it is employed in the rest of this book, and also in the original passages of the chronicles², it is evident that it was with these authors an artificial mode of expression, in the use and application of which they were but seldom successful. Its total disappearance, therefore, in MH. is but natural and inevitable.

As regards the form of the infin. with ל, it may be remarked that in the Niph'al the preformative ה is usually elided after the ל, as לישבע "to swear"; ליסקל "to be stoned," &c., though the full form is quite common, e.g. להבראות, להפרע (*Aboth*, V, 1), especially in weak verbs: להוודע (*Aboth*, IV, 22), להנדר (*Šebi'ith*, III, 9). In the Hiph'il the ה is but rarely elided, as in לרבות (= להרבות), לשהות (= לחשהות) "to cause delay" (*Erub.*, X, 5)³. This elision

¹ These two are often construed in the same way in MH., e.g. *Aboth*, III, 15 רוב המעשה; *Kilaim*, III, 1 מלא רוב הדמיון; cf. II, 6; *Šabb.*, VII, 8, &c.

² Cf. Driver, *LOT.*⁶, pp. 506, No. 12; 538, No. 37.

³ לְשֹׂמֵיחַ quoted by Stein (p. 10) is a noun = לְשֹׂמֵיחַ "for a spread" or "mat," cf. Bertinoro to *Hullin*, IX, 3.

of the ה is merely an extension to the infinitive when preceded by a preposition of the phonetic principle followed in the formation of the imperfect; cf. also the elision of the article after a preposition, and other cases of the elision of ה in Ges.-K., § 23 *k*. It is found in isolated cases also in BH.¹ and must have been very common in the colloquial language.

The analogy of the imperfect is also evident in the formation of the infin. of verbs the first radical of which is a weak letter. Thus לִישַׁן, לִישֹׁן, לִישֹׁן, corresponding to the impff. אָרַע, אָרַע, אָרַע; אִישַׁן, אִישֹׁן, אִישֹׁן = impff. יָנַף, יָנַף, יָנַף. So לִישַׁן, לִישֹׁן, except in the standing expression לִישַׁן וּלְתַת (literally, "to give and to take," i.e. "to buy," and then "to deal" in its widest sense), where the old forms have been preserved for their assonance³.

Further, לִישַׁן and לִישֹׁן = impff. יָנַף, יָנַף, but other פֿ"א verbs form the infin. regularly.

These infinitives may, perhaps, be older than the usual BH. forms with the fem. termination ת: לִישַׁת, לִישֹׁת, &c. In לִישַׁת (1 Kings vi. 19) we have perhaps a *forma mixta* of the colloquial לִישַׁן and the literary לִישֹׁת; so perhaps also תִּתֵּן (1 Kings xvii. 14, in the Kethib) may be a *forma mixta* of תֵּן and תִּתֵּן. This would go to show that there was also a colloquial infin. תֵּן without the preposition.

The inf. with ל preceded by the adjective עתיד is sometimes used to express with emphasis the occurrence of a future act or event (the *Periphrastic Future*). It is not very common in the Mišna or in the Halakic Midrašim, and where it does occur it always expresses, in accordance with the meaning of עתיד, a resolve, readiness, or obligation to perform an act, or the certainty and inevitable character

¹ Ges.-K., §§ 51 b, 53 g.

² So Sirach xxx. 17.

³ Cf. Weiss, p. 91. A similar commercial expression is חֶסֶד וְחֶסֶד "more or less" (*B. Bathra*, VII, 2 f.). Hoffmann in his edition points יָנַף incorrectly. The Targumic נִשְׁבַּח וְנִשְׁבַּח (*Zach.* v. 6, 7), and the Talmudic שָׁקֵל וְשָׁקֵל are imitations of the MH. לִישַׁן וְלִישַׁן. So also the Talmudic מִשְׁאֵל וְמִשְׁאֵל is a translation of the MH. מִשְׁאֵל וְמִשְׁאֵל "business." Cf. also Barth, *Wurzeluntersuchungen*, p. 25.

of an event¹. The following are all the instances of this construction in the Mišna:—

Demai, VII, 1 מה שאני עתיד להפריש “what I shall have to set apart.”

Megilla, II, 3 אם עתיד לחזור “if he is resolved, or going to return.”

Nedar., III, 1 כל נדר שאני עתיד לירד “every vow which I shall ever make.”

Ṭohor., IX, 2 אבל עתיד ליקח . . . אבל עתיד ללוות “he has finished gathering the olives but he is going to buy (more), he has finished buying but he is going to borrow (more).”

Ibid., IX, 6 נתנן בבית . . . ועתיד להעלותן לגג “he put them into the house, but he is going to bring them up to the roof.”

Šekal., VI, 3; *Midd.*, II, 6 בו המים מפכים ועתידין להיות יוצאין “in it the waters trickle forth and in the future they shall go forth from under the threshold of the house” (cf. *Ezek.* xlvii. 12).

Midd., II, 3 . . . וכך הם עתידים להיות שנאמר “and so shall they be in the future, as it is said ‘And he brought me forth into the outer court’” (*Ezek.* xlvi. 21).

Nazir, V, 4 “if you had known עתיד ליהרב שביה”מק that the temple was going to be destroyed”; *Sota*, V, 2; *B. Meš.*, IV, 2; *Sanh.*, X, 2; *Aboth*, III, 1; *Uḡṣin*, II, 12 (a later addition).

The construction is extremely common in the later Haggadic literature with a force analogous to that of the last examples in the list above. It is also very common in the Targumim, where it is used as a rule in the same way as in MH. (e.g. *Gen.* iii. 15, 22; iv. 10; vi. 3; xv. 12, in Jonathan). But sometimes עתיד is followed in the Targum by ך and the imperf., e.g. *Isa.* xl. 2. In Syriac ܥܬܝܕ is always followed by —ܐ and the imperf.² In PH. the construction is found only once, viz. *Job* iii. 8 העתידים עורר (= לעורר) ליתן. Note also עתידות “the destined future,” *Deut.* xxxii. 35. The root עתד is rare in the Bible, but it may have been common in the colloquial language of Biblical times.

¹ Cf. Graetz, *Orient.*, 1845, col. 87, and M. Grünbaum, *Sem. Studies in memory of Kohut*, p. 230.

² Cf. Payne-Smith, s. v.

4. THE PARTICIPLE.

In its form the MH. participle coincides exactly with the BH. participle. The feminine singular usually ends in ת־ as פֹּרֶקֶת , מִתְחַלֶּקֶת , מְרַמֶּעֶת . So also in BH. the fem. partic. with ת־ is by far the more common form. Thus in a cursory examination of the first twenty-seven chapters of Genesis the writer has found fifteen examples of the form with ת־ against hardly one with ה־ (xx. 3 בְּעֵלָה בַּעַל)¹.

The fem. of קטיל , however, and of verbs ע"ו and ל"ה always ends in ת־ .

Here we see again how little MH. grammar was influenced by Aramaic. The analogy of Aram., which forms the fem. partic. by attaching the termination א־ , י־ to the masculine, ought to have favoured the predominance in MH. of the form with ת־ , but as a matter of fact the reverse is the case. Curiously enough the scarcity in MH. of the fem. partic. with ה־ has also been attributed to Aram. influence (Stein, p. 28 (2)).

Already in BH. we find a few cases where the passive קטיל is used for the active, viz. in intransitive verbs, to express an inherent quality as בטוח , שכור ², and in transitive verbs to express an act which is so constant and continuous as to become a condition and a quality of the subject, who is thus conceived to be himself influenced and acted upon by his own act³; so אחוזי חרב "holding swords" (Cant. iii. 8); זכור "mindful" (Ps. ciii. 14), &c. This construction is more extensively used in Aram. and especially in Syriac⁴. In MH. it is not so common as in Aram., but is yet more frequent than in BH. The following is a fairly exhaustive list of examples of this usage in MH.: מְתִינִן "cautious"

¹ Cf. also Ges.-K., § 94 d.

² Cf. Ges.-K., 50f.

³ Otherwise Barth (*Nominalbildung*, p. 175 f.) who regards these forms as participles *active* derived from the *u* imperfect.

⁴ Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*, § 280.

(*Aboth*, I, 1); שָׁזִיר "watchful, diligent" (*ibid.*, II, 14); רְבוּצִים "lying" (*Bekor.*, IX, 7); טְבִילַת יוֹם, טְבִיל יוֹם "one who has bathed but has to wait for sunset in order to become pure" (*Tohor.*, II, 1 and *Tebul Yom*, *passim*). The common form כָּבִיר "thinking" is an adaptation of the Aram. כְּבִיר.

In transitive verbs: מְקַיֵּץ "having been made the recipient of a tradition" (*Pea*, II, 6, &c.; cf. *Aboth*, I, 1; ¹ מִשָּׁה קָבַל); גָּשִׁי "married" (*Yebam.*, XIII, 7, &c.), i. e. "in condition of being married," but the act of marrying is always expressed by the active הִנָּשֵׂא בָנָרִים; הִנָּשֵׂא בְּנָרִים "lacking garments" (*Kelim*, I, 2); שְׂתוּיֵי יַיִן "men who are in a state of having drunk wine"²; שֶׁלֹּא רָחוּץ יָדַיִם וְרַגְלָיִם "one who is in a state of not having washed his hands and feet"³ (*Kel.*, I, 9; *Para*, IV, 1); תְּפִיטָתֵי מַעֲשֵׂי אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם בִּידֵיהֶם "holding the acts of their fathers in their hands," i. e. conducting themselves as their fathers did (*Sifra*, ed. Weiss, fol. 112 b). So perhaps in the phrase כָּפְּוֵי טוֹבָה "ungrateful" (pl. כָּפְּוֵי טוֹבָה), if, as appears to the writer, it means "repressing, withholding thanks"⁴.

The other examples adduced by Hillel (*op. cit.*, p. 22), are true passives: שָׁקִיל "balanced" = even; תָּלִי "hanged" = hanging⁵; שָׁלִיחַ "stripped of the skin"; שָׁחִיל "suspended" = falling. In *B. Bathra*, 2 b point נָפֹל not נָפַל. The Munich cod. actually has נִפְּוֹל (*Dikd. Soferim*, ad loc.).

So also חֲלוּצָה cited by Weiss (p. 90 (א) Obs.) is conceived in MH. as a true passive, while the person whose shoe was drawn off is conceived everywhere in MH. as active, חֲלוּץ, e. g. *Yebam.*, IV, 1, 7, 8, &c.; cf. IV, 5, 6 יָבֵם אוֹ חֲלוּץ אוֹ יָבֵם (imperative), &c.

The *Negative* usually employed with the participle in MH. is אֵין, just as in BH., but frequently לֹא is used, whenever it is intended to impart a certain emphasis to the

¹ In Mediaeval Hebrew מְקַיֵּץ means "having been initiated into the *Kabbala*," a "Kabbalist."

² Cf. Lev. x. 9.

³ Cf. Ex. xxx. 10 f.

⁴ Cf. *Aboda Z.*, IV, 3. The etymology given by Levy and Kohut is improbable; cf. also Jastrow.

⁵ So תְּלוּס, Josh. x. 4.

negation. This happens either when the negative follows immediately upon an affirmative¹, or when two or more negatives follow each other. In the first case ולא has the force of "but not," and in the second case ולא... means "neither... nor..." The participial clause thus negated contains as a rule no other words but the participle.

1. *Bikk.*, I, 1, 3, 4 קורין ולא מביאין וקורין בכורים "there are some who bring first-fruits and recite, some who bring but do not recite²."

Šabb., XI, 2 אבל לא זורקין "one may hand the boards... but not throw them."

Yebam., III, 1 ff. מְתַעֲבָמוֹת וְלֹא הָרִי אֱלוֹ חוֹלְצוֹת "lo, these perform the *ḥališa* but are not to be taken in wedlock by the levir"; cf. VI, 1; VII, 4; X, 8, 9; XI, 4, 6, and *Sota*, I, 2.

Ibid., III, 6 וְנִשָּׂא אֲבָל לֹא נִשְׂא "the ἀνδρόγυνος may marry a wife but must not be married to a husband"; cf. *Sanh.*, VII, 5.

Šebu'oth משלמין ולא נשבעין "they take the oath but are free from payment."

Hullin, I, 7 מְבַדִּילִין וְלֹא תוֹקְעִין "the trumpet is blown (as a signal for stopping work) but no *ḥabdala* is recited"; so following מְבַדִּילִין וְלֹא תוֹקְעִין. Contrast with the negatives אין at the beginning of the section in non-emphatic negation or in longer clauses.

2. *Terum.*, I, 2 חֵרֶשׁ הַמְדַּבֵּר וְאֵינוֹ שׁוֹמֵעַ "the deaf who can speak," the negative not being emphatic, but following וְאֵינוֹ שׁוֹמֵעַ "who can neither hear nor speak."

Pesah., I, 5 תּוֹלִין לֹא אוֹכְלִין וְלֹא שׁוֹרְפִין "they are in suspense: neither may they eat (the leavened bread), nor need they burn it."

Beša, II, 8 אֵין מְקַרְדִּין... אֲבָל מְקַרְצֵפִין וְחֻכְמִים אוֹמְרִים אֵין מְקַרְדִּים "one may not comb a beast on the festival with an iron comb, but one may do so with a wooden comb. The Sages say one may not comb with an iron comb neither may one comb with a wooden comb." Cf. further V, 2; *Yebam.*, VII, 5; VIII, 4, 5; XI, 2 אֵין מִיָּבִיטִין וְלֹא חוֹלְצִים (contrast with XI, 5, 7 in longer clauses); *Sota*, IV, 1, 2, 3; *Maccoth*, III, 13; *Eduyoth*, V, 2 ||

¹ Cf. Geiger, p. 43.

² The section in Deut. xxvi. 5-10.

Hullin, VIII, 1; *Temura*, IV, 1; *Me'ila*, III, 1 ff. (contrast with III, 3 אין מועלים בהם); *Nega'im*, X, 4; *Nidda*, VI, 1.

3. The two cases side by side, *B. Bathra*, VIII, 1; *Horayoth*, III, 5 'כה"ג מקריב אונן ולא אוכל וההדיוט לא מקריב ולא אוכל' the High Priest may offer sacrifices on the day of the death of a near kinsman but may not eat of the sacrifice, while the ordinary priest may not offer a sacrifice nor eat of one"; *Arakin*, VII, 4; *Ohol.*, VIII, 1; *Mikwa'oth*, VII, 1; *Ukṣin*, I, 1.

In longer clauses the participle is negated by אין, e.g. *Me'ila*, I, 3; ... אין מועלים בהם ואין חיבים עליהם משום "one does not incur *Me'ila* by using them nor is one guilty in their case of ..."; *Arakin*, II, 6; *Ketub.*, V, 5.

The following are the exceptions to the above rules met with in the Mišna: לא used to negative a longer clause; *Ketub.*, VII, 6; *Nedarim*, IV, 5; cf. *Aboth*, II, 16; *Arakin*, II, 3; VII, 1; cf. also *Aboth.*, V, 14. In *Ab. Z.*, II, 5 read with N. and C. לא נהנין ולא מועלין.

In BH., too, numerous cases are found of participles being negated by לא², but very few of them can be regarded as emphatic negations. The usual explanation of such constructions on the analogy of לא עם³ (Deut. xxxii. 21) is hardly applicable to passages like Deut. xxviii. 61; Hab. i. 14; Job xii. 3, xxix. 12; or 2 Sam. iii. 34; Ezek. iv. 14 where the participle, being parallel to a finite verb, is evidently used with a verbal force. We have obviously, in these constructions, whether in BH. or in MH., an extension of the use of the general negative לא to cases regularly negated by אין without in the least implying a weakening of the nominal character of the participle. Considering also the restrictions, enumerated above, under which לא is used with the participle in MH., it will become

¹ Cf. Gen. xxxv. 18 (אנני); Lam. iii. 39.

² All the cases are collected and classified by E. Sellin, *Über die verbal-nominale Doppelnatur d. hebr. Participien u. Infinitive*, p. 27, and by J. Kahan in his dissertation with the same title, p. 19.

³ Cf. Driver to Deut. iv. 42, also *Tenses*³, § 162 footnote.

clear that it would be wrong to adduce this construction as evidence that the participle had become in MH. a mere verb just as in Aramaic.

This also applies to the *Position of the Subject* of a participial predicate. The subject whether pronoun or noun is sometimes placed in MH., as in BH.¹, after the participle, but only as a rule when special emphasis is to be placed on the participle, so that the act rather than its subject is uppermost in the speaker's mind, and is thus placed first in accordance with the general custom in Hebrew. Gradually this order of words was extended also to cases where the emphasis is faint or even entirely absent, especially in very common and colloquial phrases.

The following is a classified list of passages in the Mišna in which the participle precedes its subject:—

(1) With a noun as the subject:

Halla, I, 8 ויוצא בה אדם ידי חובתו "one may fulfil with it one's obligation," opposed to the following יוצא אדם ואין אדם יוצא.

Šabb., V, 1 "wherewith may a beast go out and wherewith may it not go out?" יוצא הגמל "the camel may go out . . ." ; so *Eduy.*, II, 7.

Beg., III, 8 אומר אדם "a man may say," opposed to לא יאמר אדם in the preceding paragraph; so הולך אדם and IV, 6, 7; *Šabb.*, XXI, 1; XXIII, 1; *Ketub.*, II, 4, 10; *Nazir*, II, 2; *Sota*, III, 4; *Kidduš*, IV, 12 מתיחד אדם "a man may be alone," opposed to the preceding . . . לא יתיחד.

B. Meš., V, 6, 8, 10; VII, 5 אוכל פועל קישות "a workman may eat cucumbers," opposed to the following לא יאכל פועל (VII, 6).

Aboth, III, 14 חביב אדם, חביבין ישראל, &c.; VI, 7 גדולה תורה; *Bekor.*, V, 5; *Kerith.*, VI, 3.

So usually in the common phrases חיב אדם "one is bound" (*Berak.*, IX, 5, &c.)²; צריך אדם "one must" (*Šabb.*, II, 7, &c.);

¹ Cf. Driver, *Tenses*, § 135 (4). So also in Phoenician: פִּיל אִיך, קָרֵא אִיך, Cooke, op. cit., No. 3, 1, 2, 3, and the note p. 21 f.

² But *Bekor.*, IV, 1: יִשְׂרָאֵל חִיבִים as the subject is emphatic: the Israelite as opposed to the priest.

ומורים חכמים "the Sages admit" (*Pea*, III, 2; *Ketub.*, II, 2; *B. Bathra*, V, 2; *Horay.*, I, 2, &c.).

(2) With a pronoun as the subject:

Šabb., III, 5 לֹא יִתֵּן לְחֹמֶר צוֹנֵן אֶבֶל נוֹתֵן הוּא לְחֹמֶר "one may not put into it cold water but one *may* put into it . . .," so below.

'*Erubin*, IV, 2 מָה אֲנוּ לֵירֵד אִמְרֵיהֶם מִתְּהֵרִים אֲתָם "may we go down?"¹ He said to them, You *may*"; *Pesah.*, II, 7 (אֶבֶל שְׂפָה הוּא) (לֹא תִשְׂרֶה) ; *Beṣa*, II, 1.

Ketub., II, 5, 6 נִשְׁבַּתִּי וְיִמְהוּרָה אֲנִי "I was indeed taken captive, but I have remained chaste"; IX, 5; *Nedar.*, IV, 4; XI, 7, 12; *Sota*, I, 5; III, 5 (טַמְאוֹת הֵן), III, 6; IV, 2; '*Eduy.*, VIII, 2; *Horay.*, I, 4.

So also with the common participle יָכוֹל which is generally emphatic: *Ketub.*, VII, 10 (*bis*, very instructive!); XIII, 5, 6, 8, 9²; *Sota*, IV, 2; *Kidduṣ.*, III, 13.

In some of the following passages the emphasis on the participle is hardly noticeable: יוֹדֵעַ אֲנִי³, *Berak.*, V, 5 (instructive!); *Nedar.*, XI, 7 (*bis*); *Nazir*, II, 4; *Nidda*, V, 6; מֻקוּבֵּל אֲנִי "I am in possession of a tradition," *Pea*, II, 6; *Yebam.*, XVI, 7; '*Eduy.*, VIII, 7; *Yadaim*, IV, 3; רִוְיָא אֲנִי⁴ "I prefer," *Kilaim*, II, 11; *R. Hašana*, II, 8; *Ketub.*, XIII, 3, 4, 5; *Šebu'oth*, VI, 3; *Abo'h*, II, 9 (2).

אֲנִי מִתְפַּאֵשׁ "I am astonished," *B. Meṣ.*, VI, 8; *Kerith.*, IV, 3.

אֲנִי זֹכֵר "I remember," *Ketub.*, II, 10; *Kidduṣ.*, IV, 14 (מִנִּיחַ); *Maccoth*, I, 1 ff.; *Šebu'oth*, IV, 1 ff.; '*Arakin*, IV, 2 (אֹמֵר); *Makširin*, I, 4 (2); *Yadaim*, IV, 3 (קוֹבֵעַ אֶתָּה)⁷, IV, 6 f.

Note also the following passages where the pronoun הוּא placed after the predicate anticipates the subject proper⁸: *Aboth*, II, 14,

¹ Literally: "What are we in respect of going down?" cf. *Tenses*, § 205.

² With omission of the pronoun הוּא. Cf. the very common technical expression — יָכוֹל שֶׁ, which stands for — יָכוֹל אֲנִי לִזְכֹּר שֶׁ—.

³ So *Koh.* viii. 12.

⁴ So *Gen.* xxxi. 5.

⁵ In later style contracted, after Aramaic fashion, to זְכוּרִי, *Talm. b. Šabb.*, 115 a, &c.

⁶ So *Ps.* xlv. 2 by which the statement in *Tenses*, § 135 (4) Obs., is to be corrected.

⁷ A reminiscence of *Malachi* iii. 8.

⁸ Cf. on this idiom below, p. 730.

16: ונאמן הוא בעל מלאכתך "and faithful is he, even thy employer"; *Para*, X, 5 אבל עומד הוא המהור XII, 5 "the clean man may stand, hold."

The contraction of the participle and the following אני into one word is sometimes found in Midrašim and in late MH. style generally, probably under the influence of Aramaic, in which this contraction takes place with the personal pronouns of the 1st and 2nd persons both singular and plural¹. Such contracted forms never occur in the Mišna. The instances quoted by previous writers rest on incorrect texts. For חוששני (*Šabb.*, XXII, 3) C. reads חושש אני "I fear²," while N. has, wrongly, חושד אני "I suspect." For גזורני (*R. Hašana*, II, 9) both N. and C. read גזור אני ("I decree"), and for מקובלני (*Yebam.*, XVI, 7; *Yada.*, IV, 2) both these texts have מקובל אני. So also *Nedar.*, I, 1 for מודרני . . . מורחקני these two texts have מודר אני . . . מורחק אני.

The substantive verb היה when combined with the participle is treated, in respect to its position, similarly to the personal pronoun. As a rule it precedes the participle, but the latter sometimes stands first for the sake of emphasis or in familiar expression.

Pea, II, 4 נהגין היו בית אבא "my father's house were accustomed," modifying the preceding statement; so *Šabb.*, I, 9; *Sukka*, II, 1; III, 9 (צופה הייתי).

Ketub., II, 3 אבל אנוסים היינו קטנים "this is our handwriting but we were forced, we were minors, we were disqualified for evidence."

Ibid., II, 5 "if a woman says איש הייתי וגרושה אני I was, indeed, a married woman but am now divorced." VII, 10 סבורה הייתי "I had thought"; *Kidduš.*, II, 5; *Nazir*, II, 4; *B. Meš.*, I, 7; *Kerith.*, IV, 2 . . . פוטרו היה ר' יהושע אף "R. J. acquitted him even . . ."; *Me'ila*, III, 7 נותנן היו ממנה זקנים contradicting the previous statement; *Para*, XII, 4. So also in BH. for the sake of emphasis: *Exod.* xxvii, 1, xxviii, 16; *Deut.* ix, 7, 22, 24; *Josh.*

¹ Cf. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*, § 64; Dalman, § 65.

² Similarly, *Dan.* i, 10 ירא אני.

v. 5; Ezek. xvi. 22, xxvi. 13, xlv. 2 (contr. xlvi. 1); Zeph. ii. 4; Ps. lxix. 9, cxxii. 2, &c. This order is also common in Aram., cf. Dan. ii. 31, 34, iii. 8, iv. 7, 10, 12, 13, 26, vi. 2, vii. 8, &c. (contr. ii. 20, 43, v. 19, 29, vi. 27, &c.). Ezra iv. 12, 22, v. 8, vi. 6 (contr. vi. 9, 10, vii. 25, 26), and often in the Targumim and in the other dialects.

The participle is sometimes used as a complement to another verb, where we should normally expect the infinitive with ל. Thus after התחיל, *Pesah.*, I, 5 העם שורפין "all the people began to burn"; *Ta'anith*, I, 4 מתענין "individuals began to fast"; *Tamid*, II, 2, 3: החלו מעלים VI, 1, 3; *Nega'im*, VII, 4. But also with the infin., *Šekal.*, I, 3 התחילו לשקול "they began to pay the *Šekel*," "they began to seize pledges for the *Šekel*," and elsewhere.

The nearest approach to this use of the participle to be found in BH. is the expression החלו כהות (1 Sam. iii. 2). Note also אהל רש (Deut. ii. 24), אהל תח (v. 25), אהל גרלך (*Joshua* iii. 7). In the Aramaic of the Targumim שרי "to begin," is usually construed with the infinitive with ל; cf., for example, Gen. vi. 1; x. 8, and the above passages in the Targumim; but occasionally also with the participle. So Deut. i. 5 in Onkelos משה פריש שרי for the Hebrew הואל . . . בַּיָּאֵר, but *Targ. Jon.* has לַמִּלְפָּא¹. In Syriac, however, ܡܠܬܝܬܝܬ is regularly followed by the participle; cf. Nöld., *Syr. Gr.*, p. 214 (bottom, Engl. tr.).

The participle is also found after נוהגין in *Pea*, II, 4 נוהגין היו "to give"²; but *Šabb.*, I, 9 שהיו . . . נוהגין "they did not shrink from preparing," beside מלישא (N. לִישָׂא); cf. also the parallel passage in *Eduy.*, IV, 8.

After the noun בשרך בני אדם שוכבים *Berak.*, I, 3 "at the hour when it is the custom of men to lie down . . . to rise up"³; *B. Bathra*, VI, 6; *Sanh.*, VII, 2 דרך כל המומתין מתורדין "it is the custom of all those about to be put to death to make a confession"; *Nidda*, II, 1. But the infinitive with ל is more common, e.g. *Berak.*, I, 2

¹ Cf. Levy, *Chald. WB.*, s. v. שרי.

² This is the reading of N. and C.

³ But N. has מלישוא.

⁴ For this sense of עמר in late Hebrew, cf. *LOT*.⁶, p. 507, No. 16.

. . . שכן דרך בני מלכים לעמוד . . . "for thus it is the custom of princes to rise up at the third hour of the day"; *Nedar.*, VIII, 5, 6, &c.

After קונם ¹, *Nedar.*, I, 4 . . . קונם פי מדבר עמך, &c. "Kōnem that my mouth speak not with thee, that my hand work not with thee, that my foot walk not with thee," II, 2, 4; III, 2; VII, 3. Contrast II, 1 מהלך שאיני מדבר שאיני מהלך; III, 11, &c.

The participle is sometimes used in apposition to the subject or object with the force of a circumstantial clause. Thus:—

'*Orla*, II, 12 בשער המזרח עומד גמליאל את ר' שאלתי את ר' "I asked R. G. while he was standing in the Eastgate²." *Nega'im*, VII, 4 שאלתי את ר"ג ואת ר"י הולכין "I asked R. G. and R. J. while they were going³."

Yoma, VII, 1 וקורא עומד; *Sota*, VII, 8 וקורא יושב; *Terum.*, II, 3 המטביל כלים בשבת שונג ישתמש בהם מזיד לא ישתמש בהם "he that bathes vessels on the Sabbath unwittingly he may use them, wittingly he must not use them"; cf. also the following clauses: *Ketub.*, IX, 6 (משמשתו נדה); *Gittin*, V, 4; *Halla*, II, 3, 7 (ערומה); *Maccoth*, III, 2 (טמא); *Ab. Z.*, IV, 10⁴; *Nega'im*, VII, 3 (מתכוין); *Sifra*, 94 c (אם וינת פנויה); further, *Pea*, III, 7 הכותב נכסיו שכיב מרע "if one assigns his property when ill"; *B. Qam.*, VIII, 6 עומדת עומדת "he watched her as she was standing"; *Menaḥoth*, V, 7 טעונים סמיכה חיים ותנופה שחוטים "they require laying on the hands when alive and waving when slain." But contrast XI, 7 אוכלין אותן כשהוא חי "the Babylonians eat it raw"⁵; *Kidduš.*, II, 1 כשהיא נערה⁶, and often elsewhere.

The same idea is expressed also with ב *essentiae* attached to the participle: בלא מתכוין "when not intentional" (*Erub.*, IV, 4); בשונג במזיד (*Kidduš.*, II, 8, &c. &c.), or by a full circumstantial clause: והם מגולים "they being uncovered" (*Ma'asereth*, V, 2); והן נהגין זה עם זה "being uttered both together" (*Šabb.*, XII, 4; XVII, 1; *Ketub.*, VII, 8, &c.). Such a clause is sometimes attached ἀσυνδεδεως לא בזה כרי להחמיץ "there being in neither sufficient to cause fermentation" (*Orla*, II, 11, 14, 15).

¹ Cf. on this word Cooke, op. cit., p. 33 f.

² C. actually reads עומד עומד.

³ But N. C. read בהולכין with ב *essentiae*; cf. also *Sifra* (ed. Weiss), 61 a.

⁴ According to some edd., cf. above, p. 668.

⁵ Cf. Onkelos, Lev. xvi. 10 ירוקם כר חי for the Hebrew חי יעמר and often.

⁶ Sirach xxx. 12 א כשהוא קטן.

Weiss (p. 89)¹ states that the participle preceded by one of the prefixed prepositions ב, ב, ל is widely used in MH. in the place of the infinitive. But this rests on a misapprehension. Forms like לשומרם, לדורכן are ordinary infinitives written *plene* = לשמרם, לדרכן.² Such forms are often found in the better texts without the vowel letter, e.g. for לשוחקן N. and C. have לשחקן "to wear them out" (*B. Mes.*, II, 8, &c.).

Forms like בעומדין, ביושבין are participles with the ב *essentiae* mentioned above: "as sitting ones," "as standing ones," i.e. "whether standing or sitting" (*Zabim*, III, 2). So also in בידוע . . . בשאינו ידוע "as known . . . as not known," i.e. "when known . . . and when not known" (*Terum.*, IV, 8). In the phrase בנותן טעם we have a standing *technical* expression to which ב has been prefixed without, however, impairing thereby the participial force of נותן. The significance of the ב varies with the context. Thus in *Halla*, III, 10 בנותן טעם (אוסר) "*Tebel* renders a food prohibited by adding to it a flavour," the ב has an instrumental significance. So in *Terum.*, X, 1; '*Ab. Z.*, V, 8 (where it is parallel to אוסר בכל שהוא "by anything"), and *Hullin*, VII, 5. On the other hand in the expression טעם בנותן טעם (*Nedar.*, VI, 6; '*Ab. Z.*, V, 2; and *Hullin*, VII, 4) the ב seems to have the force of ב *essentiae*.

The same construction is found with the *technical* and invariable expression בכונם משקה "by taking in a liquid" (*Kelim*, VIII, 2) parallel to בויתים (measured) by olives" and במשקים, i.e. with ב *instrumenti*. But in הכונם משקה (ibid., X, 8) we have the ב *essentiae*; so, probably, in *Ohol.*, V, 2 נקובה בכונם משקה "having a hole large enough to take in a liquid."

Similarly, *Ohol.*, XIII, 1 ff. בפותח טפה (שיעורו) "its measure is by an open space of a hand-breadth" (cf. VI, 5 ff.) with ב *instrumenti*.

In כחם (*Šabb.*, II, 5) the כ is used pleonastically; cf. *Yadain*, IV, 2 אתה כמחנן ממון ואין אתה אלא כמפסיד נפשות "thou art benefiting them with money but art really losing souls"; הרני כמישיב על מרפון אחי "lo, I am answering Tarphon my brother";

¹ Quoted by Driver, *Tenses* ⁶, p. 172.

² Cf. Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, 1867, p. 175; Stein, p. 27 (3) and footnote.

³ Or the expression is perhaps abbreviated from נובמן שידוע . . . נובמן שידוע. שאינו ידוע.

so also commonly in late MH. with סבורים, סבור, &c. (*Kidd.*, III, 5); cf. also the expression לביכול, the redundant use of the ל in לכשאפנה ל (*Aboth*, II, 4), לכהחלה, לכשתבא, &c.¹

This pleonastic use of כ is already found in BH., Ps. cv. 12 (כמעט); Lam. i. 20 (כמות); Isa. lix. 18 (כעל), &c.

Like Aram., MH. regularly combines the *partic. with* חיה whenever it desires to express the iteration of an act in the past or in the future, or its continuity through a longer or shorter period, the combination thus taking the place of the frequentative and iterative uses of the old perfect consecutive and of the simple tenses. The construction in MH. is, however, of native origin and not borrowed from the Aramaic. Already in BH. the *partic.* is construed with the substantive verb² not only when used in a quasi-nominal capacity (e.g. Gen. iv. 2; Deut. ix. 7; Isa. iii. 7 in the imperative; Ps. x. 14, and especially with passive participles which are treated almost like adjectives: 1 Kings x. 9; Deut. xxviii. 33, 34; Isa. ii. 2; Zeph. ii. 4), but also when the *partic.* has a purely verbal force (e.g. of the past: Judges i. 7; 2 Sam. iii. 7, viii. 15; Jer. xxvi. 18, 20; 2 Kings xvii. 32, 33; of the future: Gen. i. 6; Deut. xxviii. 29³; Isa. xxx. 20; with passive participles: Jer. xviii. 23; Ezek. xlv. 2, xlv. 1; Zech. xiii. 1). This is especially the case in the late books. Thus Neh. i. 4, ii. 13, 15, iii. 2 b, v. 18, vi. 14, 19, xiii. 5, 22; 2 Chron. xxx. 10; Dan. viii. 5, 7, x. 2; Esther ii. 7, 15, and with להיות (a genuine MH. construction), i. 22, viii. 13, ix. 21. The construction may have been even more common in the popular dialect in which the consecutive tenses seem to have been employed but sparingly⁴. This is supported by the special frequency of the construction in the Memoirs of Nehemiah which,

¹ כָּרִי (or כָּרִי) does not belong here. The כ is a radical which suffered aphaeresis in BH., cf. Barth, *Etymol. Studien*, p. 39.

² Cf. *Tenses*, § 135 (5), and, with fuller lists, Sellin, *op. cit.*, p. 35, and Kahan, p. 25.

³ Note the parallels יִשָּׁשׁ and חֲזִיחַ.

⁴ Cf. above, p. 683.

being primarily intended for private use, were but little influenced by the literary tradition, and therefore approached most nearly to the actually spoken Hebrew of the day. With the complete disappearance of the consecutive perfect in MH., and the tendency which this idiom displays to confine the simple tenses to the expression of *single* acts in the past and future respectively, the regular employment of the participle as a frequentative and iterative became a necessity. But the participle being incapable, owing to its nominal character, of expressing any relation of time has to be accompanied, wherever possible¹, by the auxiliary verb in order to indicate the time in which the act expressed by the participle occurs. The same construction is also regularly employed in modern Arabic², and is therefore a characteristic common to all those Semitic dialects in a late stage of their development which had been capable at an earlier period of developing the verbal faculty of their participles³. That in none of these dialects is the construction found so early and so extensively as in the Aram., is due simply to the fact that of all the Semitic languages Aram. was, with the exception, perhaps, of Assyrian, the first to reach its decline and to suffer the disintegration of its inflexional system and its primitive syntax. It must, of course, be conceded that the example of Aram. exercised a potent influence upon the development of the construction in MH.; but, on the other hand, there is no doubt whatever, considering the BH. instances referred to above, that Hebrew, even more so than Arabic, would have developed the construction even without any external aid whatever. All that Aram. influence could have done was to hasten the extension and firm establishment of an already existing native construction to the exclusion of other and older modes of expression.

¹ i. e. in the preterite, future and imperative, but not in the present, e. g. קָרַן, נִכְסֵן (Berak., I, 1); so קֹהֵן i. 4 דֹּוֹךְ, &c., &c.

² Cf. Spitta, §§ 109 e, 166.

³ It does not occur in Ethiopic as the participle of this language had early become fossilized into a real noun. Cf. Dillmann, § 123.

On the other hand it is worthy of note that the tenses are never found in MH. combined with היה as, occasionally, in the Targumim (e. g. Gen. iv. 1 (Jon.) וְהָיָה חֲמִידָה; Cant. i. 12 הוּא נִפְקָ¹), and very frequently in Syriac (Nöld., *Syr. Gr.*, §§ 263, 268) and in Arabic (Wright, *Ar. Gr.*³, II, § 3 (c)); also once in Phoenician, בן נִרַּר (Cooke, op. cit., No. 37, l. 5), evidently because there is nothing in BH. approaching such a use of the tenses². We see, therefore, that Aram. was incapable of forcing upon MH. anything which was foreign to the nature of Hebrew as exemplified in the Biblical books.

5. THE WEAK VERBS.

Of the verbs which have a weak letter as their *first* radical none exhibit any notable variations from the BH. types except in the infinitive discussed above (p. 685 f.). The inflexion of the other weak verbs also generally runs on BH. lines even where MH. seems to differ from the normal forms of BH. Aramaic influence is noticeable here and there, but only as accentuating and extending forms already existing in Hebrew. In many cases, however, MH. pursued its own course unaffected by Aram. influence. Thus in verbs ע"ע Aram. usually has the contracted forms, except in the Ethpe'el³. The natural affinity of these verbs with verbs ו"ע is preserved and accentuated much more strongly in Aram. than in the other Semitic languages. BH., on the other hand, as also the other Semitic languages, shows a tendency to make these verbs approximate to the standard type of the strong triliteral verb, and hence exhibits a large number of augmented forms on the analogy of the strong verb. This tendency is carried still further by MH. It has indeed preserved a considerable number of biliteral

¹ Cf. Winer, § 4, 5, 1. The scarcity of this construction in the Targumim is due to Hebrew influence.

² Cf. König, *Syntax*, § 122.

³ Nöld., *Syr. Gr.*, § 178; Winer, § 19. The augmented forms enumerated by Dalman (§ 71) are all much later than MH.

forms as, e.g. יחוף (> חפף), יבור (> ברר), לכום (> כסם), למור (> מדר), and so exclusively in the causative stems: להקל (*Makšir.*, III, 4), הוחמו (*Šabb.*, III, 4), ייצו (*Ab. Z.*, III, 9), מיטב (*Sanh.*, II, 1), מייסד (*Erub.*, X, 8); also in the Niph'al: יחפו (*Šabb.*, III, 5), ¹ליהם (*Kelim*, XIV, 1), נמקי (*Bikk.*, I, 6)²; but more commonly we find the trilateral forms, e.g. רקקה (*Yebam.*, XII, 2), צררו (*B. Meš.*, III, 10), למדור (*Beša.*, IV, 6), לגרור (*Šabb.*, XVII, 2) and so normally in the Niph'al; להפלל (*M. Seni.*, II, 5), ליצו (*B. Kam.*, IX, 1), נקצו (*Bikk.*, I, 6), נגדרת נגדרין (*Beša.*, II, 10), נקצו (*Nid.*, II, 1), נקק (*Neg.*, V, 4, 5)³. So also the participles of the Qal which are never found with biliteral forms. In the intensive stems, too, the trilateral form is the regular one, as often in BH.⁴, e.g. מַחֲלֵל, מַגְבֵּף, מְפַרֵר, מְוַשֵּׁק. But instead of Pi'el, the Pilpel is very common: מַחֲלֵל, מַקְלֵל, &c. The Po'el, however, is very rare (e.g. in elevated diction: יְחַוְּנֵי יְסוּבְבוּ, *Sota*, IX, 15)⁵. The Hithpo'el is found in the common word נִתְרַעַע "to become worse" (cf. Isa. xxiv. 19), and in מִשְׁתוּמָם (*Isa.* lix. 16). In the perfect Hiph'il occurs the form הִקְלַת, traditionally pronounced הִקְלַתָּ, for BH. הִקְלִיתָ; cf. BH. הִתְלַתָּ (*Judges* xvi. 10). So also in the ע"ו form הִעֲדַתָּ (*Yebam.*, VII, 3) as in BH. הִנְפַתָּ. These forms are evidently due to the analogy of the strong verb.

Other noteworthy points in the MH. treatment of ע"ו verbs are the following: in the Niph'al the preformative נ is pointed נִ, obviously through the analogy of the strong verb, e.g. נִיצוּק (*Yada.*, IV, 7), נִיווּת (*Ketub.*, XI, 1), נִיעַר (*Aboth*, III, 4)⁷, נִילוּשֶׁת (*Menah.*, XI, 1), נִידוּן (*Sanh.*, VIII, 6);

¹ With elision of the formative ה, cf. above, p. 685.

² Also cited by Stein (p. 39) may be from חוש (*Koh.* ii. 25) and not from חוש.

³ In BH. the biliteral form only is found in the Niph'al.

⁴ Ges.-K., § 67 u, end.

⁵ A later addition not found in N.

⁶ In the historical Baraitha *Kiḏduš*, 66 a noticed above, p. 682, note 2.

⁷ Cf. Zech. ii. 17, also נָמַל *Gen.* xvii. 26 f.; see Ges.-K., § 72 ee.

but also גָּרַן (*B. Kam.*, II, 5; *Yada.*, IV, 3, &c.; cf. 2 Sam. xix. 10), נָלַן (*Kilaim*, IX, 8, BH.).

The Hiph'il imperfect אֹבִיחַ (*Ab. Z.*, III, 5) seems to be a metaplastic form for אֵבִיחַ; cf. in BH. בֹּרַשׁ הוֹבִישׁ¹. For הוֹבִיחַ "he caused it to lie fallow" (> בֹּרַשׁ, *B. Mes.*, IX, 3; *'Arak.*, IX, 1) both C. and N. read correctly הַבִּירָה. הוֹשִׁיבוּ (> שׁוּב, *Tosefta Sota*, I) cited by Stein (p. 44) is no doubt a scribal error for הַשִּׁיבוּ. So אֹחִיל (> חוֹל, *Sifré*, Num. vi. 26) is an error for אֵחִיל, caused by the following אֹלִיד.

In the intensive stem occur all the three formations found in BH., thus Pil'el: נִחְמוֹטֵט, עוֹרֵר (rather rare); Pilpel: בִּלְבַל, מְטַמֵּט, נִמְנֵם, מְטַמֵּט; and Pi'el proper: קָיַם² (BH.), קָיָם (BH., *Sirach* xlii. 23), קָיַיִן, קָיַיִן, קָיַיִן, &c.

The last-mentioned formation is generally considered to have been borrowed by late BH. from Aramaic. But without entering upon the vexed question as to the original character of the ע"י verbs, it must be remembered that the same formation is found in other Semitic languages also beside Aram. and late Hebrew. Why should not קָיַם and קָיַיִן be just as original in Hebrew as قَامَ in Arabic? That earlier Hebrew possessed the power of converting the vocalic middle radical into a hard consonant is shown by the cognate nouns אָיִן, מָוִת, &c., and by the uncontracted verbs like רָוַח, עָוַר, עָוִת which, as König shows³, belonged originally to the same class as the contracted verbs, the hardness of the *waw* being caused by the presence of other weak letters in the root. It would therefore be but reasonable to expect that, with the gradual disappearance of the Polel conjugation and with the increasing tendency of adapting the weak verb to the standard of קָטַל, the Hebrew language itself and unaided should make use of its power to harden the middle radical in order to provide itself with

¹ Cf. Bacher, *Terminologie*, p. 8.

² The קָל occurs in an old Mišna, *B. Kam.*, I, 12 and elsewhere. For the weakening of the *waw* into *yod* cf. יָד from יָדָה, &c.; also Syriac ܩܠܩ pronounced *qayem*, and vulg. Arabic *qāyil* for *qā'il*, *bāyi* for *bā'i*, Spitta, § 105 e.

³ *Lehrgebäude*, I, p. 452 f.

a Pi'el of ע"ו after the analogy of the strong verb. It may even be assumed that such forms had existed in the vernacular long before they made their appearance in literature¹, and that from the vernacular they descended directly into MH.

The close affinity between *the verbs* ל"א and *verbs* ל"ה caused already in BH. a frequent interchange of forms between these two classes and a general unsettlement of their respective types. This becomes more pronounced in MH., and so we meet with forms like קורין (but also קוראים)², מקרין (*Bikk.*, III, 7), ממרין (= ממראין "to fatten," *Šabb.*, XXIV, 3); קרי, מצוי, נשי, so always in the singular; לקרות³ (*Berak.*, I, 1), יצתה or the *forma mixta* יצאה⁴ beside יצא (cf. *Ges.-K.*, 74 h). Cases of ל"ה verbs taking ל"א forms are not so frequent. Examples are: the feminine of the participle נעשית Niph'al נגיה⁵ (= נפלאה, *Deut.* xxx. 11; נקראה, *Megilla*, I, 1, &c.), and by analogy of the partic. also the perfect נגיה, נגיהה (= נגיהה, cf. the similarity of the perfect נקטלה in pause נקטלה to the partic. נקטלה. The tone rested probably in both cases, at least in colloquial speech, on the penultima, *Ges.-K.*, p. 94 f. note and the reff.). Further before pronominal suffixes עשאתן (*Bes.*, III, 2), פדתן⁶ (*Pea*, IV, 8), רחאתן (*Gittin*, VI, 6), &c. But it is important to remember that, in spite of the frequent interchange of forms between these two verbal classes, each of them retains, nevertheless,

¹ König (loc. cit.) thinks that forms like ע"ו had existed in the spoken language, though not in literature, before the *Polel* ק"ו came into use as an intensive.

² Cf. קוראים, *Ps.* xcix. 6.

³ Cf. קראה, *Judg.* viii. 1.

⁴ Probably, as Weiss (p. 39) observes, because יצאה would hardly be distinguishable in sound from יצא as the א was not pronounced distinctly.

⁵ For נעשה נקח, which would normally be in MH. נעשה נקח, cf. above, p. 688.

⁶ C. reads נקח.

in MH. its own particular individuality and its distinctive characteristics. The relation of the two verbal classes to each other remains in MH. practically the same as in BH. and as in Assyrian and classical Arabic¹, except that in MH. ה"ל forms predominate over א"ל forms, thus exhibiting the beginnings of the final triumph of the ה"ל class. In Aramaic, on the other hand, and in modern Arabic the א"ל verbs disappear entirely, being completely absorbed by the ה"ל class².

Stein (p. 49 f.) asserts that the participle Kāl of verbs ל"ה is sometimes formed in MH. after the Aramaic fashion with ā in the first syllable. But this assertion rests on insufficient evidence. Of the instances which he adduces, שפין (*Eduy.*, I, 8; cf. *Ab. Z.*, III, 10) is from שוף "to rub"; צבה (*Bekor.*, VII, 5) is an adjective which is already found in BH. (Num. v. 21); so also כָּלָה (*Terum.*, VII, 7) and the late, though frequent, combination פָּרִין וְרִבִּין "fruitful and multiplying" may be adjectives. Note that in neither of them is there a corresponding finite Kāl in MH., and פרה as a verb does not occur in MH. at all. The participle of זכה is always זָכִין, זוכין, except in the legal maxim וְאִין בִּפְנֵי וְאִין זָכִין, except in the legal maxim וְאִין בִּפְנֵי וְאִין זָכִין (Zeken, I, 6, &c.), where the a in זָכִין may be due to assonance with the following חָבִין.

He further regards the forms העני "he became poor," מתמיה "astonishing," and יופי "to be fair" as evidence of the existence in MH., as in Syriac, of ל"י verbs. But העני is clearly a denominative of עני, מתמיה is Hiph'il of תמה, and for יופי we ought to read יִפֶּה; cf. above, p. 673.

THE NOUN.

As in the other parts of speech so also in the treatment of the noun, MH. followed faithfully the traditions of BH. This is true in the main both of the formation of the noun

¹ Cf. Ges.-K., § 75 *nn ff.*; Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gr.*², § 150; Wright, *Arab. Gr.*³, I, § 132, Rem. a.

² Cf. Dalman, § 72, 1; Spitta, § 130 b. In Syriac only the intensive stem of the verb חל and of one or two others has preserved the original א"ל forms. All other א"ל verbs have been absorbed by the ל"י (= 'לה) class. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*, § 177, C, Rem.

The form is also used in MH. in abstract sense, e. g. מיתה "death," and the affix ית— is sometimes added in order to strengthen its abstract character, as, e. g. פרישות "separation"; גמילות חסדים "performance of kindness"; שפיכות דמים "bloodshed"¹.

The verbal noun מִקְטָל or מִקְטֵל, which is analogous to the Aramaic infinitive *Peal*, is only found in MH. in מָנַע (*Hullin*, IV, 4; *Kelim*, XVIII, 6), the other instances being BH. words: מָתַן (*Aboth*, II, 1), מָשָׂא (*ibid.*, IV, 22; cf. 2 Chron. xix. 7), מִמְּרָר (*Megilla*, III, 2).

Piel. The verbal noun of the intensive stem is קָטֹל (= קִיטוֹל)² formed at will from any Pi'el, e. g. בָּטוֹל, בָּבוֹד, נִיפּוֹךְ, בִּיעוֹר, עִירוב, (also concrete); of ל"ה verbs וִידִי, מִיחִי, עָנִי, and so of ל"א roots as כִּילִי; קִיּוֹם עוֹזֵת: ע"ו; in ע"ע roots the noun assumes the form of Pilpul: דְּקָרוֹק, דְּקָרֹל, בְּעֵבֶד, הִרְהוֹר; cf. also the three Šaph'el forms peculiar to MH., שְׁעָבִיד, שְׁעָבִיר, שְׁחָרִיר. The form is sometimes used in the plural only in an abstract signification, usually of a technical nature: אִירֹסִין, קְדוּשִׁין ("betrothal"); נִשְׁוֹאִין ("marriage"); מִיאִוִּין ("refusal" of a wife to cohabit with her husband to whom she had been married by her mother or brothers while still a minor), גִּירֹשִׁין ("divorce"), &c. In a concrete sense the form is found in יְשׁוּב ("a habitation, settlement"), חָפִי ("a covering," *Kelim*, XVI, 17), כָּפִי ("a lid"), מִינֹף ("filth"), &c. In BH., too, this ground-form has generally in the singular a concrete signification: תַּלְמִיד, צָפִי, לָמוֹד ("disciple"); but abstract in שְׁלֹמִים and the fem. שְׁלָמָה (*Ps.* xci. 8), and of ע"ע root תִּרְהוֹר (*Deut.* xxviii. 52); so especially in the plural גִּדּוּפִים, מְלֹאִים, נְחֹמִים, שְׁלֹמִים. In Sirach: חֲמוֹר xiv. 14, יָסוֹר xl. 29, לָמוֹר (abstract) lxi. 28, נָסוֹר xxxi. 1, xlv. 20.

Another verbal noun belonging to this stem is the form קָטֹלָה which is identical with the Aramaic infinitive *Pa'el*, but is used in MH. rather more as a true abstract than as a *nomen actionis*. Examples: כַּפָּרָה "atonement"; בְּנֹנָה "devotion" (direction of the mind); סִכְפָּנָה "danger"; קִבְּלָה "receipt"; עֲכָבָה "delay," "detention"; also as a concrete, "rim" (*Ab. Z.*, V, 1), so חֲרָרָה "biscuit."

¹ אִירֹסִית cited by Hillel (p. 20) does not belong here, being a denominative of אִירֹס; so וְהִירָה of וְהִירָה, &c.

² The corresponding form in Syriac is ܩܬܠܐ, Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*, § 117.

³ Cf. Nöldeke, *op. cit.*, § 123.

The BH. instances are comparatively late: בקרה (Ezek. xxxiv. 12), בקשה (Esther v. 7; Ezra vii. 6), נאצה (Neh. ix. 18, 26; cf. Ezek. xxxv. 12), and נחמה (Job vi. 10; Ps. cxix. 50). It is to be observed that this form is not very frequent in MH., and that it cannot be formed at will as קטיל.

Hiph'il. The causative stem has two *nomina actionis*, viz. הקטל and הקטלה. Examples of הקטל are: הבער, הפשט, הקטר, הרגל, הרגל, &c. This form is practically the old infin. Hiph'il fossilized into a noun. The traditional pronunciation with *ē* after the preformative seems to have arisen through the influence of the vowel *ē* of the second syllable. When followed by a genitive, however, it generally preserves, if tradition can be trusted, the old pointing; so הניץ החמה (Berak., I, 1; Nidda, IX, 9), הישג יד ('Arak., IV, 1; Sifra, fol. 24 b, c), הישב אברה (B. Mes., VII, 4), הערב שמש (Halla, I, 9), העלים שרץ, &c. (Šebu'oth, II, 4).

Examples of הקטלה are: הבערה, הדלקה, הטמנה, הכנסה, הפסקה, הוראה, הוצאה, הוספה; תבאה; התזה, הנחה; ¹הרקרה, הרכבה, הפרשה (or הוריה), השקיה, &c., &c. With א for ה, in Aramaic fashion, we meet in אוכרה (BH.), אזהרה, ²אבעיה, and אונאה.

The form הקטלה, which is identical with the Aramaic infin. of Aph'el (Haph'el), is more common in MH. than הקטל. It is probably older than the ordinary infin. with *ē* (= *i*) in the second syllable ³. In BH. it is found as early as Isaiah: הכיר (>) היקר (xxx. 28). Further with א in אוכרה (Lev. ii. 2, &c.); beside הנחה (Esther ii. 8) and הצלה (iv. 14). In Sirach: השנה (xxxv. 10) and הוראה (li. 17); הצנע (xvi. 25; xxxii. 3; cf. Mic. vi. 8).

Here may be mentioned the verbal noun השתחוויה, plur. השתחוויות (Tamid., VII, 3, &c.), which already occurs in the N. Israelitish document, 2 Kings v. 18.

That these verbal nouns are not borrowed by MH. from Aramaic is proved by their occurrence in BH., often in the older books. Their scarcity in the literary language of

¹ This list of the form הקטלה in strong verbs, to which many more might be added, disposes of Hillel's statement (p. 37) that הקטל is generally used in strong verbs and הקטלה in weak verbs.

² Cf. Bacher, *Terminologie*, p. 41.

³ Cp. Barth, *Nominalbildung*, pp. 73, 90.

BH. may be ascribed to the highly developed nominal constructions of the infinitive in BH. which made the use of those nouns unnecessary. In Aramaic, moreover, these forms are used as pure infinitives to express, with prefixes, the complement of another verb. MH., on the other hand, uses for this purpose the old infinitive with ל while these forms are employed only in a purely nominal capacity.

The *nomina agentis* with the termination יָ- may have been borrowed by MH. direct from Aramaic, and when their form had become firmly established in the language, new nouns were formed out of Hebrew roots on the model of these naturalized foreign nouns, e. g. רִצָּעָן, רִצָּהָן ("saddler, shoemaker")¹, רִשָּׁן. On the other hand the *denominative adjectives* terminating in יָ- may be purely Hebraic formations; examples, מִכְּבֵן "shaped like a hammer," לִפְתָן "turniplike" (> לַפֶּת), *Bekor.*, VII, 1, and the feminine, which ends in נִית—. Cf. the BH. לִיחָן, נחשתן (prob.); ידעוני, אדמוני, and the fem. רחמניו (Lam. iv. 10). In Sirach נִבְהָן (iv. 29).

The adverbs מִעֲלָן "above," מִתָּן "below" (*Zebah.*, II, 2, III, 6; *Ohol.*, XII, 8, XIII, 3, and *Sifra*), have probably preserved the old adverbial termination מִ- changed into יָ-. So also the frequent adverb לְהֵלָן (or לְהֵלָן ?) "yonder, there," which in Aramaic has no final *n* except in the late Galilean dialect³.

Here may be mentioned the *nomina agentis* of the form קטול which occur but occasionally in MH. but are so common in Aramaic under the form קטולא, מְקַטֵּל⁴. The following examples of this formation occur in MH.⁵: טָחוֹן "a miller" (*Demai*, III, 5); קרוֹן

¹ Cf. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*, § 130.

² Cf. Ges.-K., § 100. *g*, *h*.

³ Cf. Dalman, p. 102 e. In פִּירְשָׁן, פִּרְשָׁן (*Aboda Z.*, I, 5), quoted by Hillel (p. 43), the *n* is a pronominal suffix.

⁴ Nöldeke, *op. cit.*, § 107.

⁵ Cf. Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 176, and Hillel, without mentioning Barth, p. 27 f. These forms have been misunderstood by previous writers, cf. Geiger, p. 44, 6; Graetz, *Orient.*, 1845, col. 87 (cf. *ibid.*, 1846, col. 373); Weiss, p. 90; Siegfried and Strack, § 68 c.

"a woolcomber" (*Kelim*, XXVI, 5); plur. כְּרוֹקוֹת (ibid., XII, 2), and the following which occur in the plural only: דְּרוֹכוֹת "wine-presses" (*Terum.*, III, 4; cf. Isa. xvi. 10, &c.); תְּבוֹרוֹת "tenants, farmers" (*Bikk.*, I, 2); מְשׁוּחֹת "surveyors" (*Erub.*, IV, 11; *Kelim.*, XIV, 3); גְּרוֹסוֹת "gristmakers"; דְּשׁוֹשׁוֹת "groatmakers" (> דֵּשֶׁשׁ = דֵּישׁ; *Mo'ed Kat.*, II, 5); לְקַחוֹת "purchasers"¹ (*Ketub.*, VIII, 1, &c.), and according to the best texts also לְעוֹזוֹת "men speaking a foreign tongue" (*Megilla*, II, 1), but note the following singular לוֹעֵז. So also always לֹקֵחַ "a purchaser," and not לְקִיחַ. This may perhaps be due to a deliberate change of spelling on the part of the scribes who mistook the form לְקִיחַ for the partic. passive לְקִיחַ.

The same form is found in the following *names of instruments*: שְׁחוֹר "a razor" (*Kelim*, XIII, 1); דְּקוֹר "a borer" (XIV, 3); מְחֹק "an instrument for levelling a measure of grain" (XVII, 16), רְחוֹשׁ "a stew-pan" (cf. the references in the *Kohut*, s. v.)².

These forms occur already in BH., viz. אֶמּוֹן, בְּחֹן, חֲמוֹץ, יָקוֹשׁ, עֶשֶׂן; perhaps צְרוּף "a refiner" (Jer. vi. 29; cf. LXX ἀργυροκόπος); the feminine בְּגוֹדָה; and as a *nomen instrumenti*: תְּקוֹעַ (Ezek. vii. 14). This fact and also the rareness of the form in MH. prove conclusively that the form was not borrowed by MH. from Aramaic.

2. DIMINUTIVES.

MH. possesses a number of diminutive formations which, though not so fully and so strongly developed as in Arabic or as the secondary formations in Syriac³, are yet sufficiently numerous and strongly marked as to deserve fuller treatment than has been accorded to them by previous writers⁴. We give below classified lists of the various forms; many of these, it must be admitted, are necessarily

¹ The explanation of Jastrow, s. v. (so Dukes, op. cit., pp. 75, 101), will not apply to most cases where the word is used.

² In *Beṣa*, I, 7, cited by Hillel (p. 28 B), read הָקָרִי עֵץ "the wood used in the pot," i.e. the ladle; so all the commentaries (against Levy, *NHWB.*, s. v.), cf. Raši, כף גרולה.

³ Cf. Wright, *Arab. Gr.*³, I, § 269; Nöldeke, §§ 131, 132; also Ges.-K., p. 250 footnote.

⁴ Cf. Barth, op. cit., p. 313 f.; Hillel, p. 45 f.

dubious, but they are sufficiently probable to deserve to be included here.

1. Diminutives formed by the insertion of the vowel *ei* (originally *ai*), or more usually its contracted form *i*, after the second radical: בורירה¹ "a little oil-press" (> בר, *Šebi'ith*, VIII, 6); שומירה "a watchman's hut" (*Erub.*, II, 5, according to N. and cod. Munich; C. has שומרה. In *B. Bathra*, IV, 8 both C. and N. have שומרה. In *Kilaim*, V, 3 both C. and N. have שומרה, but the Munich cod. reads שומירה; cf. also Maimonides and other commentaries, ad loc.). These two forms exhibit the vowel *u* after the first radical as in Arabic and in Aramaic². Further, תפיסה "a small bag" (*Gittin*, III, 3; *B. Mes.*, I, 8; cf. the explanation in the *Gemara*, fol. 20 b חמת קטנה); עריסה "a cradle" (*Kelim*, XVI, 1. Contrast with ערש Deut. iii. 11. A large bed is always מטה in MH.). Perhaps כנימה "vermin" (? a collective? *Makšir.*, VI, 1). In ע"ע roots the second radical is repeated; כיריה "a little pitcher" (*Tosefta Menah.*, IX, 10); סלילה³ "a little basket" (*Ab. Z.*, II, 7). Cf. also בורירה (> בר) mentioned before. Further, כפיפה "a basket" (from כפה; *Terum.*, IX, 3; *Kel.*, XXVI, 1; *Sota*, II, 1); C. and cod. Munich read in both places קפיפה which, according to Wright⁴, is a diminutive of קופה. If so, the form will also exhibit reduplication, which is a further method of forming diminutives; cf. below. Reduplication also appears in חריר⁵ "the eye of a needle," from the ע"ו noun חור "hole," and perhaps סליל "shuttle," from סל⁶ (*Neg.*, XI, 9). The words are probably to be pointed חריר, סליל just like the BH. וְעִיר; so also the Aram. וְלִילָא, וְלִילָא (Targum, Prov. xiv. 6, xii. 9, xxviii. 7).

Barth, who denies the existence of the diminutive in Hebrew, ascribes this formation in MH. to the influence

¹ This is the reading of C. and N., cod. Munich has בורירה, evidently a corruption of בוריה. Other texts have בירה.

² Wright, l. c.; Nöldeke, § 112; Barth, l. c.

³ So N. and C.; other texts have סלילה.

⁴ op. cit., p. 167, Rem. Cf. Kohut, s. v. כפיפה.

⁵ *Kelim*, XIII, 3 מחט שנישל חרירה "a needle the eyelet of which has been removed"; של סקין שנישל חרירה "a needle of sack-makers, the eyelet of which, &c."

⁶ Cf. Jastrow, s. v. Here perhaps belongs BH. אָלִיל, a contemptuous diminutive of אֵל "god," or of אֵל "nought."

of Aramaic. But surely the Aram. contemporary with MH. could not possibly have been conscious of the diminutive force of **חֲכַמְלָא**, **סְלִילָא**, since it stopped short at two¹ words without extending this formation to other nouns; how then could it have influenced MH. to form about ten new diminutives? There can be no doubt whatever that this formation is genuinely Hebraic. Its use must have been confined to colloquial and familiar speech in which diminutives abound in almost all languages. Hence its absence in the literary dialect of BH. and its occurrence in Isaiah's parody of the speech of drunkards (Isa. xxviii. 10, 13 four times) and in the deliberately familiar and condescending words which Elihu addresses to Job (Job xxxvi. 2). Elsewhere Isaiah uses the ordinary and polite form **מְנַיֵּץ** (Isa. x. 25, xvi. 14, xxix. 17; also xxiv. 6).

It is noteworthy that all the MH. forms given above, with the exception of **חֲרִיר**, are feminines. Below we shall find this gender alone in another form expressing the diminutive. It is but natural that the feminine, being the weaker gender, should be used for that purpose. Further, the diminutive expresses either endearment or contempt, both sentiments naturally inspired by the female and not by the male sex.

2. By reduplication: **בַּצְלָצוֹל** "dwarf onion" (*Kilaim*, I, 3); **סַמְרָמוֹט** "lappet, rug" (*Šabb.*, XXI, 2, &c.); **סַלְסָלָה** "small basket" *Tanḥuma* to Lev. xix. 2, opposed to **סַל גָּדוֹל** below. So, as the text stands, in BH. Jer. vi. 9; cf. Raši, ad loc.). With the reduplication of the third radical only and the addition of the feminine termination **ִית** — **תְּלִילִית** (plur. **תְּלִילִיּוֹת**) "a little heap or hill" (**תַּל**; *Ohol.*, XVI, 2); **שְׁלִילִית** "a pool" (ibid., XVI, 5). Further, **גִּבְשׁוּשִׁית** "a hillock, heap" (*Talm. b. Šabb.*, 73 b, probably an Aramaic word); **עַפְרוּרִית** "a little dust" (*Talm. b. B. Bathra*, 93 b)³.

¹ So according to Barth, who regards **חֲכַמְלָא** as a loan-word from the Arabic.

² Cf. Nöldeke, § 134.

³ Note the presence in these forms of the vowel *u*.

Several Pilpel formations may also perhaps be regarded as expressing the diminutive idea; so certainly נמנם "to doze" (cf. Levy, *Ch. WB.*, s. v. נים); לחלה or לכלך (> לה) not "to make very wet" but "to soil."

Compare further זעטוט or זאטוט "young man, student," from זוטא¹ and דונית (or contracted to דונית) "a light fisherboat."

BH. parallels are to be found in שחרחרת (Cant. i. 6) which can only mean "blackish" = "dark"; so ירקרקת "yellowish" = "pale" (of Esther's complexion, *Talm. b. Megilla*, 13 a). Perhaps also ירקרק (Lev. xiii. 42, 43²), אפפסוף (contemptuously, Num. xi. 4) "rabble," and פרחח (contemptuously, Job xxx. 12) "low brood"; cf. פרחי כהונה "young priests" (*Yoma*, I, 7; *Tam.*, I, 1).

3. By adding the termination י— or ין³ —הַבִּינוֹת, "little jars" (> Kelim, II, 2) שומניית "small kind of garlic" (> with the addition of the feminine termination, cf. No. 4, *Kilaim*, I, 3); perhaps also קנון⁴ "a basket of reeds" (? *Beṣa*, I, 8; *Kelim*, XVI, 3 הגדולים הקטנים, הק' הגדולים); ניקון (BH.) "little (?) javelins" (*Kel.*, XI, 8). Cf. further the Aramaic גנוניתא "a little garden" (*Targ. j.*, Exod. ii. 21; *Talm. b. Berak.*, 43 b של גנוניתא של⁵ "a portable brazier" (> כנה, בן "base of stone," so Jastrow); כנונית or כנונית "a little chamber" (> כן "to arrange" (?) *Talm. b. Hullin*, 56 b); כלניתא or כולניתא "little bride"—a kind of plant.

4. By adding the feminine termination ית : גרורית "a little band" (*Sifra* בחקתי in the beginning)⁶. Perhaps also עססית or עסיסית "pounded wheat or peas" (> עסה⁷ *Tosefta Beṣa*, I, 23); דונית "a light fisherboat"; סנונית "a swallow"; כלבית "a kind of small fish"; סממית "a poisonous spider" (> סם⁸ BH. שממית) *Talm. b. Šabb.*, 77 b.

¹ So Jastrow. Levy identifies it with the Greek ζῆντης.

² Cf. Ibn Ezra, ad loc. In *Neg.*, XI, 4 it is explained as an intensive.

³ Cf. Ges.-K., § 86, 9 and footnote, and Nöldeke, § 131.

⁴ Cf. Hillel, l. c.

⁵ Cf. Dalman, § 30 B.

⁶ So Raši to Lev. xxvi. 31 and Jastrow. But ראב"ד to the *Sifra* (l. c.) explains our word as "foundation" and this is adopted by Levy, s. v.

⁷ So Jastrow, s. v.; cf., however, 'Aruch, s. v.

⁸ So Jastrow, s. v.

Several BH. nouns ending in יָת— may also perhaps be regarded as diminutives, e. g. צִלְחִית (2 Kings ii. 20) as compared with צִלְחָה (ibid. xxi. 13 and especially 2 Chron. xxxv. 13); מִנְקִית (Exod. xxv. 29, &c.); שְׂאֲרִית.

5. By periphrasis with בֶּן חֲרִיץ: “a small ditch” (*B. Bathra*, VII, 4); בֶּן פִּטְיִשׁ “a small hammer,” *Kelim*, XXIX, 7). Perhaps also בֶּת קוֹל “the Bath Kol”; cf. BH. בְּנֵי יוֹנָה, בֶּן בָּקֶר, &c.

3. THE PLURAL.

The plural termination of masc. nouns is in MH. almost as often יָם— as יִם—. This is especially the case in participles. This termination is not an Aramaism. The *n* is common to nearly all Semitic languages¹ and is the only form found on the Meša' stone, though Phoenician uses only *im*. In BH. the form *in* is found pretty often² and as early as the Song of Deborah (מְרִיץ, Judges v. 10), and must have been more common in the spoken language than in the literary dialect. Its frequent occurrence in poetry tends to support this view. For unlike the prose writer, the poet does not easily allow himself to be fettered by convention and fixed rules; and if he be especially a lyrical poet, as almost all Hebrew poets are, he will give expression to his feelings and thoughts in a style and in a form which are most natural to him. The poetical parts of the Bible, therefore, present in many respects a more accurate picture of the language of their time than the contemporary prose which we may assume, on the analogy of the literary style of other languages, had to conform to a certain standard set up by earlier writers, and to employ only the forms and expression current in the polite, but in many respects artificial, language of the educated classes. So that in the case of the plural termination also we find MH. preserving and extending a feature peculiar to the spoken language of Biblical times, as distinguished from the literary language of the Biblical books.

¹ Cf. the table in Zimmern's *Vergl. Gr.*, p. 74.

² Cf. also Sirach, כִּי־עֲרִיץ, כִּי־עֲרִיץ (xiii. 22), כִּי־עֲרִיץ (xvi. 15).

Besides the ordinary plural terminations of the feminine וֹת— or יֹת— (in case of singulars ending in יֵת—, יֹת—), a number of nouns form their plural in MH. by the termination אֹת— : מקֶּחַ: “bath,” pl. מִקְוֹת (but also מְקוֹת); מִשְׁתָּה— (or מִשְׁתִּיּוֹת)¹ מִרְחֵץ “a bathing establishment,” מִרְחָצוֹת; שֹׁרֶה (or שׁוּרָה) “backbone” שִׁרְאוֹת; cf. also בִּירָאוֹת “wells” (*Erub.*, III, 1), כּוּמְסָאוֹת (*Pea*, V, 8).

This termination is especially common in foreign words, e.g. אִמְבִּיאוֹת, pl. of אִמְבִּי “bath-tub”; אִפּוֹתִיקָאוֹת—אִפּוֹתִיקָא (*γλω-γλιμα*); גִּמְטְרִיא—גִּמְטְרִיאוֹת (*στροά*); אִיצְטְבָּאוֹת—אִיצְטְבָּא (*μετρία*); דִּיּוֹמָאוֹת—דִּיּוֹמָא (*δελαιτα*); דּוּגְמָאוֹת—דּוּגְמָא (*tabula, τάβλα*), &c., &c.

Luzzatto² explains this termination as a combination of the Aramaic fem. plural תָּאִת— with the Hebrew וֹת—. Similarly Nöldeke³ who goes further and maintains that irregular Hebrew plurals in וֹת— of masculine nouns like מְקוֹמוֹת, מִבְּחֹחוֹת are also to be traced to Aramaic influence.

A far easier and more natural explanation of these MH. plurals seems to the writer to be the following. The vowel *ā* was inserted before וֹת— from a desire to make these plurals, especially those of recently acquired nouns, conform to the standard type of feminine plurals which has the vowel *ā* before the termination וֹת— (e.g. מְלָכוֹת,⁴ צִדְקוֹת), and for the sake of euphony an *ā* (or *ī*) was inserted between this vowel *a* and the termination to serve as bearer of the vowel *ō* with which the termination begins⁵.

¹ These two plurals may exhibit the return of the old third radical *y*, since the *ā* was usually pronounced as *y*. Cf. מִקְשָׂאוֹת (*Šebi'ith*, II, 1), pl. of מִקְשָׂה = מִקְשָׂה “a cucumber field,” Isa. i. 8.

² *Orient.*, 1847, No. 1, col. 2. So already Salomon Levysohn in his essay cited above, p. 649, note 2.

³ *Beiträge*, &c., p. 57.

⁴ Cf. the table in *Ges.-K.*, p. 289.

⁵ Though not etymologically similar, it may, nevertheless, be interesting to compare these forms with the BH. plurals חֲלָאִים, דּוּרָאִים, יוֹלָאוֹת (Ps. x. 10, cf. *Ges.-K.*, § 93 x), and the MH. בְּרָאִין, בְּרָאִין, בְּרָאִין, pl. of בְּרָא, בְּרָאִין (often spelt בְּרָאִין, וכאִי רשאי and כְּרָאִי), and BH. קְשׁוּאִים, pl. of קְשׁוּא as in MH.

In MH., as in BH., the rule that the masculine forms the plural by יָם— and the feminine by וֹת— holds good only in the case of adjectives and participles. In the case of nouns the exceptions are so numerous as almost to break down the rule, e. g. מַפְתָּחוֹת — מַפְתָּח; חוֹתָמוֹת — חוֹתֶם, &c., especially in nouns ending in יָם—, סִימָן — סִימוֹנוֹת “horse-radish”; צֶנֶן — צִנּוֹנוֹת, שְׁלַחֲנוֹת, קִרְבָּנוֹת : וֶן— “a corn merchant” (σιτάρης?); cf. also the plural of *nomina agentis* דְּרוֹכוֹת, סְרוּקוֹת, above, p. 709.

Conversely feminine plurals in יָם—, יָם— : טֶפֶן — טֶפֶה “drop”; חוֹרֵת — חוֹרֵין “leek”; קִישוּיִן — קִישוּי “cucumbers”; דְּלוּעִין — דְּלוּעָה “gourd,” and, of course, שְׁעוּרִים — שְׁעוּרָה, חֲמִים — חֲמָה, &c.

Note.—The BH. singular אִשְׁפוֹת is only found in MH. once (*Kelim*, XXVII, 11). Elsewhere it is always אִשְׁפָּה, but the plural is regularly אִשְׁפָּחוֹת, at least in earlier MH. (*Šebi'ith*, III, 1, 2, 3; *Ohol.*, XVIII, 8, &c.). In view of these facts Geiger's¹ ingenious explanation of MH. אִשְׁפָּה as an artificial singular derived from BH. אִשְׁפוֹת which was mistaken by the Rabbis for a plural, falls to the ground. Probably the BH. אִשְׁפוֹת is a secondary form, with *ā* obscured to *ō* of אִשְׁפָּת, from the verb שָׁפַת² with prosthetic א, whence the plural אִשְׁפָּחוֹת (like נִמְלִים). The old form אִשְׁפָּת, however, survived in popular speech, but the ending ת— being mistaken by the popular mind for the old feminine termination, the word was shortened to אִשְׁפָּה; but the plural אִשְׁפָּחוֹת was already too firmly established to be changed accordingly.

4. THE DUAL.

The dual is pretty common in MH. not only in words which have the dual in BH. but also in many new formations. This is another proof that MH. and Aramaic have little in common in the sphere of strict etymology. For Aramaic, as is well known, has with one or two exceptions, entirely lost its dual, while in MH. it has survived with

¹ op. cit., p. 24. Levy (*Orient*, 1844, p. 815) regards BH. אִשְׁפוֹת itself as pl. of the sing. אִשְׁפָּה and אִשְׁפָּחוֹת as a double plural.

² Cf. the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, s. v.

increased vitality. We give here a list of all the duals found in the Mišna which do not occur in BH.¹

אַחֲרָיִם "back" (*Kelim*, XXV, 1 f.); אֶצְבָּעַיִם "two fingers" (*Ohol*, XIII, 1); גַּבִּיִם "back" (*Kelim*, XXV, 5); נְפִיִם "wings"² (*Hullin*, III, 4); טַפְחָיִם "two handbreadths" (*Menah.*, XI, 5; *B. Bathra*, I, 1); פְּאֵרִים "two kors" (*Kelim*, XV, 1); מְנַפֵּיִם "greaves" (*ibid.*, XI, 8); מַחְלָצִים "windlass" (*Mo'ed Kat.*, I, 10); מַסְפָּרִים "scissors" (*Kelim*, XVI, 8, &c.); קָבִים "two kabs" (*Eduy.*, I, 2; *Tamid*, III, 6); קֶרְפִּים "intestines" (*ibid.*, IV, 2); קֶרְסוּלִים "ankles" (*Hullin*, III, 7); רִבְעֵתִים "two-fourths" (*Kerith.*, I, 7); שוּלָיִם "skirts" (*Kelim*, XV, 1); שְׁרִיטִים "remnants" (*Erub.*, II, 6, &c.). Further, שְׁנֵי תַּיִם "two spans" (*Baraita*, *Talm. b. Ta'anith*, 5 a) and בֵּית הַמִּטְבָּחִים "the slaughter-house" (*Aboth*, V, 5; *Middoth*, III, 5). The Aramaic בִּי מַטְבַּחִיא must be an adaptation from MH., as shown by the ט.

5. THE EXPRESSION OF THE GENITIVE.

(a) *The Construct State.* The most usual and predominant method of expressing the genitive in MH. is still by means of the construct state. Circumlocution of the genitive is resorted to, as a rule, only in certain cases and under certain restrictions, viz. when the grammar or the desire for lucidity and precision would make the employment of the constr. st. awkward or impracticable. MH. differs in this respect also from Aramaic. The latter, too, in the earlier Jewish dialects, makes a most extensive use of the constr. st. But in MH. the respective usages of the constr. st. and of circumlocution can be classified under certain headings and explained by certain logical and grammatical rules; in Aramaic, on the other hand, the two constructions are found side by side without any apparent cause,

¹ The dual is often spelt יָם—.

² i. e. the limbs on which the כנפים "the feathers" grow. Hence the Mišna says נשחרור גפיה but נמרשו כנפיה.

³ So according to the traditional pronunciation. Levy and Kohut point הקטפודים, but the form קטפוד is not found elsewhere. Jastrow points הקטפודים.

depending, as it seems, entirely upon the momentary whim of the speaker or writer whether he chooses to use the one or the other¹. Contrast Ezra v. 13 (מִלְכָּא דִּי בְּבֹל .) with vi. 14 (מִלְךְ פִּרְס); Ezra v. 14 (מִאֲנִי דִּי בֵּית .) with vi. 5 (מִאֲנִי בֵּית); especially in the Aram. of Daniel: Dan. ii. 19 (חֻזָּא דִּי לִילִיא) with iv. 2, 6; ii. 49 (עֲבִירְתָּא דִּי מְדִינָתָא) with iii. 12; iii. 1 (צִלָּם דִּי רַהֲב) with iii. 5, 7, &c.; v. 5 (פִּס יֶרֶא) with v. 24, &c. Instances of the indiscriminate use of the two constructions in the Targumim are too numerous and too well known to require special mention here (cf. Winer, op. cit., § 56).

Though, as stated above, the constr. st. is the regular form in MH. for the expression of the genitive, it may nevertheless be useful to classify the chief cases of its use.

(1) It is used with *nomina actionis* as *regens*: מִנְעַ טְרֵפָה “the touching of a *terepha*” (*Hullin*, IV, 4); מִרְחַן סָבִיב “sprinkling of the blood round about the altar” (*Zebah.*, XIV, 10; cf. VIII, 10); מִלֵּא רַחֲבַּת הַפֶּרֶס “the full breadth of a step.”

נְטִילַת לֹלֶב “the taking of the palm-branch” (*Pesah.*, VII, 12); יְדִיעוֹת הַטּוֹמְאוֹת “cases of knowledge of uncleanness” (*Šebu’oth*, I, 1); further concrete: פְּחִילַת הַבְּגָד “the lappet of a garment” (*Šabb.*, II, 3), &c.

בִּטּוֹל בֵּית הַמִּדְרָשׁ “the neglect of the house of study” (*Šabb.*, XVI, 1); עִירוּבֵי חֻמוֹמִין “*Erubim* of limits” (*Erub.*, VII, 11); מִיעוּט הַקְּהָל “delay of judgment” (*Aboth*, V, 8); concrete: מִיעוּט הַכְּלִים “the minority of the assembly” (*Pesah.*, VII, 6); קִלְקוּלֵי הַמִּים “the lids of the vessels” (*Šabb.*, XVII, 8); further

¹ It is, however, to be noted that in the Zinjirli Inscriptions the constr. st. alone is used; cf. the text in Cooke, op. cit., Nos. 61-3. On the other hand in the Aramaic Papyri of Assuan the constr. st. is confined to “the most common words where the relation is a close and natural one” (Cowley, *Introd.*, p. 19).

The constr. st. has been given up almost entirely by the late non-Jewish dialects of Aram., e.g. Syriac (Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*, § 205, B), the Christian Palestinian Aram. (Nöldeke, *ZDMG.*, XX, p. 507, § 36), and nearly so in Mandaic (cf. Nöldeke, *Mand. Gr.*, § 221, f.).

² Cf. Lev. xxiii. 40.

³ Cf. Lev. v. 2 f.

(*Naz.*, IX, 3); תנחומי אבלים (*Megilla*, IV, 3); תלמוד תורה (*Pea*, I, 1); תכשיטי נשים "ornaments of women" (*Pes.*, III, 1; *Kelim*, XI, 6); חשמיישי הכלים (*Tamid*, V, 3); רשות הרבים "a public place"; קלות ראש, גמילות חסדים, &c. &c.¹

Numerals, with the exception of שנים, שנים which are always in the constr. st., are generally construed in apposition to their substantives², but the following constructs occur in the Mišna: ארבעת (*B. Bathra*, II, 5; VI, 7); חמשת (*Nedar.*, VII, 2; *Sota*, VIII, 2); שבעת (*Bikk.*, I, 3; *Yoma*, I, 1, 2, 4), and עשרת (*Sanh.*, X, 3).

In the following passages אחת may be either in the constr. st. or in apposition: מאחת יד "from one place" (so Maimonides, *Pea*, III, 3); באחת יד "with one hand" (*Šebi'ith*, III, 9); באחת ידיו "with one of his hands" (*Para*, VII, 2, 3). Elsewhere this numeral follows the noun. (Cf. *Neh.* iv. 11 באחת ידו, and see König, *Syntax*, p. 240, Note 2.)

The *Plural of construct combinations*³ is generally formed by attaching the termination to the *regens*, e. g. חומי צמר, &c. "woollen threads" (*Šabb.*, VI, 5); צורפי זהב "goldsmiths" (VIII, 4); פקיעי עמיר "bundles of sheaves" (XXIV, 2), &c., &c. Occasionally both members of the combination receive the plural termination: בתי בנסיות ובתי מדרשות "synagogues and houses of study" (*Terum.*, XI, 10; *Pesaḥ.*, IV, 4 and often); בתי הברדים (sing. בית, הבד "wine-presses" (*Ma'as. Seni*, III, 7); בתי נירין "meshes, slips" (בית ניר, *Šabb.*, VII, 2); אבות בתי דינין "Chiefs of the *Beth Din*" (sing. אב בית דין, *Hagiga*, II, 2; cf. *Sanh.*, XI, 2); בתי דשנין (sing. בית הדשן, *Sifra*, fol. 9 b) "receptacles for ashes"; בעלי אימניות "artisans" (*Bikk.*, III, 3); בעלי שיבות "greyheads" (*Nedar.*, III, 8); בעלי דינין "litigants" (*Aboth*, I, 8, &c.); בעלי מומין "defective" (*Bekor.*, VII, 6, &c.); בעלי בתים "householders"

¹ It will be seen that many of these governing nouns are invariable in the constr. st., a fact which disproves the statement of Levy (*Orient*, 1884, col. 813, so Wijnkoop, *J. Q. R.*, XV, p. 44, without mentioning Levy) that the genitive of invariable nouns is expressed in MH. by circumlocution with *וְ*.

² But they are always placed in MH. before their substantives. Cf. Ges.-K., § 134 c and footnote 1.

³ With the following remarks cf. Ges.-K., § 124 p, ff.

⁴ The plural is formed from בְּנֵי (Aboth, IV, 11), and not from בְּנֵי.

(*Kelim*, XVII, 1 and often); בעלי קריין (sing. קרי ¹, *Mikwaoth*, VIII, 1); ראשי חדשים (sing. ראש חדש) "New Moons" (*Pesah.*, VII, 4); ראשי דברים (*R. Hašana*, I, 1); ערבי (II, 6); פסחים "Eves of the Passover" (sing. ערב פסח, *Pesah.*, IV, 1, X, 1; *Eduy.*, V, 2); ערבי שבתות "Eves of the Sabbath" (*B. Mes.*, IV, 6); דיני ממונות "civil cases" (*Sanh.*, I, 1); דיני נפשות "capital cases" ²; ערי נפשות "witnesses in capital cases" (*ibid.*, I, 4, IV, 5); חייבי חטאות (*Šabb.*, XI, 6); חייבי מיתות (*Sanh.*, VII, 10); חייבי כריתות (*Makkoth*, III, 15; cf. *Kerith.*, VI, 4); contrast חייבי עולה (*Temura*, V, 1); גטי נשים "bills of divorce" (sing. גט אשה); שחרורי עבדים "bills of manumission" (*Gittin*, I, 4 and often).

On the other hand a number of combinations with בית as *regens* attach the plural sign to the *rectum* ³: בית המשתאות "banqueting houses" (*Sota*, IX, 11); בית הברדן "wine-presses" (*B. Bathra*, III, 1); בית האצבעות (טוהרות) "gloves" (*Kelim.*, XXVI, 3); בית פרסות (sing. בית פרס) "a field declared unclean owing to bones having been carried over it from a ploughed grave" (*Ohol.*, XVIII, 2); בית הקמטים, בית הסתרים (אינן צריכים); בית המומאות (. . . מטמאין) (*Mikwaoth*, VIII, 5); בית השווקים "market-places" (*Makširin*, VI, 2).

So also with regard to the other rules and idioms peculiar to the constr. st., MH. agrees almost in every respect with BH. There is, therefore, no need to recapitulate them here. The following points, however, may be noted:—

The construct before a relative clause is not found in MH. except in the case of a number of nouns, the construct form of which has become stereotyped in certain connexions; hence we get the following combinations: — אף על פי ש "although"; — בומן ש "when"; — כרי ש "in order that"; — כלפי ש ⁴ "in respect to"; — מפני ש "because"; — משום ש "because"; על שם ש "because" and על מנת ש "on condition that."

So the noun חזקה "state, assumption," which is very common in the constr. st. before a noun (e. g. *Ketub.*, I, 6, 7; *Nazir*, IX, 2;

¹ Cf. Deut. xxiii. 11.

² Contrast *Targ. j.*, Num. xv. 34; xxvii. 5 ממונה but דיני ממונה.

³ Cf. Hillel, p. 47; Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*, § 141.

⁴ Construct of אפי. The כ is redundant, cf. above, p. 697 f.

B. Bathra, III, 1 f., &c., &c.), is also found in the construct before a relative clause: בחזקת שהוא קיים "on the assumption that he is alive" (*Gittin*, III, 3, 7, 8; cf. III, 4); בחזקת שנתן, בחזקת שלא נתן "on the assumption that he has given, . . . that he has not given" (*B. Bathra*, I, 4); בחזקת שלא נפדה (*Bekor.*, VIII, 6). So in *Tamid*, III, 3, after five cases of the construct לשכת before nouns, we get by analogy עושין עושין, &c.

Two instances only have been found by the writer of a construct before a preposition, viz.: בהולכי לבית המדרש¹ (*Aboth*, V, 14), and *Mekilta*, fol. 61 b לעולי לברמי מלכים. This is the more unnecessary since the MH. construct may regularly have the force of a preposition; cf. מהלכי שחים "bipeds" (= על, *Bikk.*, II, 3; *Sifra*, fol. 48 d); פסולי עדות "disqualified for evidence" (= לֹא; cf. the phrase פסול לעדות *Ketub.*, II, 1); יוצאי מצרים (*Nedar.*, III, 2); יורדי הים (III, 6).

(b) *Circumlocution of the Genitive*. The restrictions which the constr. st. by its peculiar nature, its inflexibility and awkwardness imposes upon the language must have been felt keenly by the Semitic dialects. Add to this the fact that in the many nouns which are invariable (and in dialects with a poorly developed vowel-system almost all nouns are invariable), the constr. st. lost even its outward semblance of an inflexional distinction, leaving thus the relation existing between the nouns ambiguous and uncertain, and it will be easy to understand the necessity felt by the Semitic dialects of devising some new means for expressing the genitive relation³. Being

¹ So N. and other edd.; C., however, has בהולכי ביהמ"ד. Cf. Ges.-K., § 130 a f.; Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*, § 206.

² Cf. Ps. cvii. 23. In BH. this construction is confined to the poetical style, Ges.-K., § 116 h.

³ Kautzsch (*Bib. Aram.*, § 81, footnote) ascribes the origin of the circumlocution of the genitive to the desire of making the *regens* definite. But it is evident that this desire was only one of the many causes at work, since circumlocution is very common in languages like Assyrian and Ethiopic which do not possess the article or its equivalent. Further, we have cases in Hebrew where circumlocution was chosen for the special purpose of leaving the nouns *indefinite*, e.g. 1 Sam. xvi. 18 בן לישי, 1 Kings ii. 39 עזרים לשמני, cf. Ges.-K., § 129 c.

no longer capable of producing any internal or inflexional change in the nouns concerned, they had to fall back upon a periphrasis of the genitive. This they did by inserting a particle between the two nouns. In the selection of this particle the Semitic languages divide themselves into two groups. Those languages in which the period of decay set in early in their history, when their mode of thought was still of a primitive nature, viz. the Assyrian, the Aramaic dialects, and the Ethiopic, selected for this periphrasis the *demonstrative particle*, which had already come into use as a connective link in the form of a relative: Assyrian *ša*, Aramaic *š*, *š*, and finally *š*, *-š*, Ethiopic **H** (י) ¹. Thus in *מלכא די ביתא* (*domus iste rex*) the particle *די* merely points out that there is a connexion between the two nouns without attempting in the least to indicate explicitly what that connexion is. Convention alone determined that the connexion should be understood as that of the genitive relation, just as it was convention alone that determined the relation of a clause introduced by the same particle to the principle clause of the sentence ². The particle thus used as a genitive did, therefore, as much as the older constr. st. For the latter did no more, at least in historical times, than merely indicate by its juxtaposition with the *rectum* and its hurried pronunciation, often producing a vocalic change, that some kind of connexion existed between the two nouns, which connexion was commonly understood to be that of the genitive.

Those Semitic languages, however, which had been endowed with greater vitality, and did not feel the need for a substitute for the constr. st. till a comparatively late period in their development, viz. Arabic, Hebrew, and

¹ Cf. Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gr.* ², § 84 a; Dillmann, *Eth. Gr.* ², §§ 145, 6, 186. **A** (י) in simple circumlocution is rare in Ethiopic, and only when the relation may also be conceived as that of the dative (Dillmann, § 145, 6). Amharic expresses the genitive exclusively by circumlocution with **ע** (י), a weakened form of **H** (ibid., p. 289, footnote).

² Cf. Ges.-K., § 138 a.

Phoenician, could not when that need arose be satisfied with the primitive method adopted by the first group. It was found necessary to indicate quite clearly the relation subsisting between the noun and its genitive. Classical Arabic, with its highly developed inflexional system in which, moreover, annexion had been fortified by a real genitive termination attached to the *rectum*, seems to have never experienced any real need for a substitute to this construction. Only occasionally do we find the genitive of material expressed by circumlocution with *مِنْ*¹. But Modern Arabic, in consequence of the loss or confusion of the old case-endings, has felt itself compelled to devise some periphrasis of the genitive. In the Egyptian Arabic annexion is being supplanted by a circumlocution which is expressed by placing the noun *betā'* ("property, possession") between the *regens* and *rectum*, where it signifies "peculiar to," "belonging to." It stands in apposition to the *regens* and in constr. st. to the *rectum*, the latter being thus governed by it and subordinated to it as its genitive².

In Hebrew circumlocution of the genitive is expressed by the preposition ל "belonging to" and the construction is exactly the same as in Modern Arabic. Thus in מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד or רוּחוֹת לְבַל בָּשָׂר the ל stands in apposition to מִזְמוֹר and רוּחוֹת, while דָּוִד and בָּשָׂר are governed by and subordinated to the preposition as its genitive³. This primitive construction, however, of simple apposition between the *regens* and the preposition had to give way in this case, as also in other cases, to a smoother and more logical construction⁴, in which the connexion between the *regens* and the preposition was specified by the originally demonstrative link אֲשֶׁר, so that the determining words

¹ Wright, *Arab. Gr.*³, II, § 48 (9). The constructions with *ل* enumerated *ibid.*, § 53 (b) are real datives.

² Cf. Spitta, §§ 77 c, 119 a ff., 120 c, also Gesenius, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 672 f.

³ Cf. Wright, *op. cit.*, I, § 355, and Ges.-K., § 101.

⁴ Cf. *Tenses*³, p. 246.

were practically placed in a relative clause, e.g. הפלגשים
בנה המעיל אשר לשאול, אשר לאברהם.

The colloquial form of אשר ל— was —לָּשׁ¹, a form which found its way also into the literature². From —לָּשׁ to the formation of an independent particle שׁל is but an easy and natural step, and thus arose the genitive particle שׁל which in MH. is the only means for expressing circumlocation of the genitive, but which must have existed in popular speech long before it was reluctantly admitted into the literary dialect of BH.

So in Phoenician the periphrasis of the genitive is effected by prefixing ל to the *rectum*, and then by —אשׁל (= —ל אשר) and finally by שׁל. Only in very late times, under the overpowering influence of Aramaic, against which it was apparently more powerless than MH., Phoenician often uses for the genitive simply —שׁ³.

The foregoing remarks prove conclusively that the MH. circumlocation of the genitive with שׁל is an original Hebrew construction and not an adaptation of the Aramaic circumlocation with ד. For the two particles differ most essentially and radically. ד indicates some vague connexion between the two nouns which it joins together, while שׁל expresses explicitly and with precision the relation existing between them. שׁל is not the equivalent, much less the translation of ד. It says a great deal more than ד and has had an entirely different history and development. Neither has שׁל any connexion with the Aramaic hypothetical דל. דל is never used without either the prefix —ב or the pronominal suffixes, while שׁל is extensively used

¹ Cf. above, p. 659 f.

² Cant. iii. 7; cf. 2 Kings vi. 11, Cant. viii. 12, and Jonah i. 12.

³ Cf. Schröder, *Phoen. Sp.*, §§ 68, 69 and 82, 83. Instances in BH. of the use of אשר alone to express the circumlocation of the genitive seem to occur in 1 Sam. xiii. 8, 1 Kings xi. 25, 2 Kings xxv. 10 (cf. || Jer. lii. 14), and 2 Ch. xxxiv. 22. But most probably the text in all these passages is at fault. Cf. Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, p. 746 note, the Oxford Lexicon, p. 83, and König, *Syntax*, § 283.

when standing alone. It would, perhaps, be more correct to say that דיל was influenced by של. דילי, &c., is only used exclusively in Syriac. In the non-Jewish Palestinian dialects of Aramaic (די + יי) only is found¹. In the Targumim and in the Aramaic of the Talmud both דיל and די are found, but the latter more frequently. Only Onkelos who is noted for his Hebraizing tendencies uses דיל exclusively, most probably because the author, or authors, of this Targum spoke MH. Moreover, the Targumim actually use —ל = של to express the circumlocation of the genitive where the Hebrew text has —ל אשר, instead of simple די, —ד, e. g. Gen. xxv. 6 דלאברהם, xxix. 9 דלאברה (די לעברך. *Onk.*; *j.* לעברך); Exod. xxix. 26 דלאהרן (*j.*, *Onk.*; די לאהרן), xxvi. 29 both דלאהרן; Lev. ix. 15, xvi. 15 דלעמא, &c. &c.

Circumlocation with simple ל, though very common in BH.², is extremely rare in MH. and generally only when the ל may also be construed as ל of the dative or of reference³. The following is a fairly exhaustive list of these constructions in the Mišna:—

Pea, II, 6 הלכה למשה מסיני (perhaps sc.: למ' נתונה).

Pesah., I, 1 אור לי"ד "the eve⁴ of the fourteenth"; so *Kerith.* אור פ"א; but the parallel passage in *Eduy.* has אור לפ"א.

R. Hašana, I, 1 ראש השנה למלכים, &c.; *B. Meṣ.*, V, 1 תחלה זנב, &c.; *Sanh.*, VIII, 5 כינום לרשעים, &c.; *Aboth*, IV, 2 קודם לעשיתן, &c.; but the ל may be here a sign of the accusative; cf. *Kerith.*, VI, 8 קודם את האב, &c.

Menah., VIII, 1, 3, 6 אלפא לסולת, &c. "αλφα (=the first, best of) fine flour"; *Temura*, I, 1 מתנה לכהן (perh. sc. לב' נתונה, but cf. the common phrase מתנות פהונה); *Kelim*, XVII, 11 מבי' ירות, &c. "two parts of a loaf, which loaf is a third of a Kab⁵"; *Zabim*, I, 2 ביום השלישי לספירת זובו.

¹ Cf. Dalman, p. 118, 4.

² Cf. König, *Syntax*, § 280 f.

³ As in Ethiopic, cf. above, p. 722, note 1.

⁴ Cf. the Aram. אורחא.

⁵ For the peculiar use of כ cf. *B. Meṣ.*, VIII, 9; *Menah.*, IX, 3; *Para*, I, 1. So in Syriac, Matt. xx. 2: *כי* (in the *Pešittā*).

V, 5); כן "base" (*Yoma*, V, 2); מחתת הכסף (*Tamid*, I, 4, V, 5. These sections, however, belong to the older strata in the Mišna).

(2) When there are more than one *regens* dependent upon one *rectum*; *Ma'asereth*, I, 7 טבל של ענבים וטנאים; cf. *Terum.*, XI, 4; *R. Hašana*, IV, 6; *B. Mes.*, X, 1 f., &c. Cf. in BH. Gen. xl. 5; Exod. xiv. 28; 2 Kings xi. 10.

(3) When the *regens* consists of a construct combination in which the second member is inseparable from the first. *Demai*, IV, 1 (&c.) דמאי של דמאי; IV, 3, 4 דמאי של דמאי; *Sebi'ith*, I, 2, &c., &c.

Conversely when the *rectum* is made up of such a compound expression: *Šabb.*, XX, 5 מְכַבֵּשׁ שֶׁל בְּעִל־בָּחִים; *B. Kam.*, I, 2 נִכְסִים שֶׁל בְּנִיבְרִית, &c., &c. Or when both *regens* and *rectum* consist of compound expressions: 'Erub., VIII, 4 תְּפִיסַת־יָד שֶׁל 'Erub., VIII, 4 בְּעִל־הַיָּדָיִם; *Yoma*, III, 2 יוֹמֵי־הַכְּפֻרִים, &c.

There are, of course, numerous exceptions to this rule, e. g. שמחת בית-השואבה, *Sukka*, V, 1; cf. V, 3, &c., &c.

Cf. in BH. Gen. xxv. 6 (לִבְנֵי־הַפְּלִגְשִׁים אֲשֶׁר לְאַבְרָהָם); Num. xvi. 22, xxxi. 48; Judges vi. 25, xviii. 28. (See for further examples König, *Syntax*, §§ 281 l-m, 282 e, f, and cf. also Dillmann, op. cit., § 186.)

(4) When an adjective intervenes between *regens* and *rectum*: *Yoma*, V, 6 מִזְבַּח הַחִיצוֹן שֶׁל מִעֲרָבִי יָסוּד; *Sukka*, II, 6 לִילֵי יוֹם טוֹב; *Demai*, VII, 8 עֶשֶׂר עֶשֶׂר שָׁנִים, &c., &c. So with numerals: *Demai*, VII, 8 עֶשֶׂר עֶשֶׂר שָׁנִים "ten rows of ten wine-jars each"; 'Arakin, IX, 6 שְׁנֵי בָתִּים שֶׁל שְׁנֵי שָׁנִים; *Kilaim*, IV, 5 שֹׁרֵה שְׁנֵי שָׁנִים; *Pesaḥ.*, VIII, 1 עֶבֶד שֶׁל שְׁנֵי שָׁנִים; *Nedar.*, VIII, 7 בֶּן אֶחָד שֶׁל שְׁנֵי שָׁנִים, &c., &c. Cf. in BH. 1 Sam. xxii. 20 (בֶּן אֶחָד); Ezek. xl. 40 b; so in Assyrian (Delitzsch, § 166, 2) and Ethiopic (Dillmann, § 186).

(5) Circumlocution is generally used with nouns borrowed from other languages including Aramaic, since the language was no longer able to assimilate them so thoroughly as to inflect them like native words: *Kidduṣ.*, IV, 5 מֶלֶךְ שֶׁל מֶלֶךְ "the King's στρατιά"; 'Ab. Z., II, 1 פֻּנְדְקָאוֹת שֶׁל עֹבֵי־עָלְמָא "the πανδοκεία of the heathen"; IV, 6 מְלָכִים שֶׁל מְלָכִים, &c. &c.

¹ The numeral repeated in a distributive sense. Note the *suspended construct*.

² Cf. Jastrow, s. v.

(6) Generally circumlocation is used when for one reason or another the *regens* or *rectum* is to be emphasized, as when a noun is used in a secondary or derived sense¹, e. g. *Kelim*, XIII, 1 זוג של ספירים "shears of barbers" (זוג-ספירים may mean "a pair of barbers"); XIII, 2 השן של מערר "the tooth of a mattock," &c., or in enumerating many cases which either agree or differ from one another: *Kelim*, XIII, 6 טבעת של מתכת . . . טבעת (של אלמוג); XIII, 8 (מסרק של פשתן . . . ושל צמר); XIV, 8; XV, 2; XXIII, 2, 4; XXIX, 4-6, &c., &c.

Cf. in BH. 2 Sam. iii. 2-3 (לאביגיל, לאחינעם).

(c) *Circumlocution with Anticipation*. The circumlocutory genitive is often anticipated in MH., as in Aramaic, by a possessive suffix attached to the *regens*, e. g. שלוחו של אדם "a man's messenger." The construction is only found as a rule in cases of true (possessive) genitives², but in the following passages it is used also with the objective genitive of *nomina actionis*:

Sebi'ith, II, 3 כז ששית כך של ששית "just like the thinning and trimming of the fifth so of the sixth."

Yoma, VII, 2 הפשיטן וניתוחן של אלו "the flaying and cutting up of these."

Yebam., XI, 7 על מכתו ועל קללתו של זה ושל זה "for the striking and cursing this one and that one."

The construction is only employed when the *regens* is a flexible noun, which is elsewhere found in the constr. st., as otherwise it could not take the suffix. Generally the construction has an emphatic force, laying a certain stress on the *regens*, the *rectum*, or on both, or on the connecting particle. Frequently, however, it is used without any apparent emphasis in familiar and colloquial language, especially in the Haggadic style, which should be attributed to Aramaic influence. (Cf. above, p. 726.)

The genitive is almost always determinate in one of the following ways: by a suffix (e. g. תבואתו של חברו, *Kila.*, VII,

¹ Cf. below, p. 733.

² So regularly in Syriac, Nöldeke, § 205, C.

With ב: only in the phrase בו ביום "on the same day"¹ (*Sabb.*, I, 4, &c.). With לא כל הימנו מן הראשון: מן "everything does not depend on him, even on the first"² (*Gittin*, VIII, 8; cf. *B. Kam.*, X, 2).

Anticipation of the subject by הוא is found in the following passages in the Mišna: *Bikk.*, III, 6 (עוֹרְיָהּ הַסֵּל); *Pesaḥ.*, IX, 10 (שָׁלָנוּ הוּא הַפֶּסַח, &c.); *Yebam.*, XVI, 1 מעוֹבֶרֶת הִיא (צִרְתָּה); *Aboth*, II, 14, 16; *Para*, X, 5, XII, 5³.

This idiom of anticipation is not, however, peculiar to MH. and to Aramaic.

There are very many examples of it in BH. Thus: *anticipation of the subject* by הוא, as in אחת היא יונתי (Cant. vi. 8, &c.). See Driver's *Tenses*, § 201, for a full treatment of this particular construction.

Anticipation of the genitive occurs in BH. in the following passages:—

(1) Before the construct state: Jer. lii. 20 (לְנַחֲשֵׁתָם כָּל הַכְּלִים). In the parallel passage, 2 Kings xxv. 16, the suffix is indeed omitted, but it is attested here by the Ancient Versions, which, however, omit the following genitive); Ezek. x. 2 לְאַרְבַּעָתָם מִזִּקְצֹעוֹת; xlvi. 22 בְּבָאֵם הַכּוֹהֲנִים; xlii. 14 בְּבֹאֵי הָאִישׁ (but the genitive which is diacritically pointed by the Massorah should probably be omitted as in the Versions); Ps. xlix. 14 לְמוֹ דִּרְכָם כָּסֵל (?); Prov. xiii. 4 נִפְשׁוּ עֵצַל; Job xxiii. 9 בְּהִלֵּי נֵרוֹ; Ezra ii. 62 || Neh. vii. 64 כְּתָבָם הַמַּתִּיחִשִּׁים; Ezra iii. 12 לְתוֹלְדוֹתָם רֵאשִׁי; 1 Chron. vii. 9 (?).

In Isa. xvii. 6 the ה should probably be attached to the following genitive: הַפּוֹרִיָּה; so in Prov. xiv. 13 read: וְאַחֲרֵית הַשְׂמָחָה.

(2) Before a genitive introduced by ל; Num. i. 21-43 ... פָּקְדֵיהֶם לְמֹטֶה; Ezra ix. 1 ... כְּתוּבֵיהֶם לְבִנְעִי; 2 Chron. xxxi. 18 לְכָל קָהָל ... טַמֵּם; cf. also 1 Chron. iv. 33 וְהַתִּיחֶשֶׁם לָהֶם, vii. 4 לְתוֹלְדוֹתָם לְבֵית (?).

¹ Cf. Dan. iii. 6-8, 15; v. 11; Ezra v. 3 (בְּהַ זְמַנָּה); see Kautzsch, op. cit., § 88.

² C. has wrongly הימנו. N. is corrupt.

³ Cf. the quotation above, p. 693.

Anticipation of the accusative: Exod. ii. 6 .. ותראהו את ; Deut. iii. 14 .. את . . . ויקרא אתם (cf. Driver, ad loc.); 1 Kings xix. 21 בשלם הבשר ; xxi. 13 את נבות ; 2 Kings xvi. 15 ויצוהו (Kethîb) ; Jer. xix. 14 מאכילם את העם ; Ps. lxiii. 12 ; 1 Chron. v. 26¹ ויגלים לראובן ; xxiii. 6 להגדוד ; ויחלקם . . . להגדוד ; 2 Chron. xxv. 5 לבית . . . ויעמידם , v. 10 להגדוד . . . ויבדילם .

The above lists, supplemented by the references given in Driver's *Tenses*, § 201, containing passages drawn from all parts of BH., prose and poetry, early and late, will have made it abundantly clear that the anticipation of a following noun by a preceding pronoun or pronominal suffix is a genuine Hebrew idiom and not an Aramaism. The idiom is, moreover, extremely common in Assyrian before a genitive introduced by *ša*. The genitive so introduced may even precede the *regens* with the attached suffix (Delitzsch, § 166, 3). It is also widely used in Ethiopic whenever the noun is to be conceived as determinate both in the genitive and in the accusative, the particle introducing the noun being always א (l) even with the genitive, and not H (t) as in simple circumlocution (cf. Dillmann, § 172 c). It follows, therefore, that the anticipatory constructions in MH. are of native origin and not borrowed from the Aramaic, though the latter may have exercised some influence upon their usage.

It may be remarked that the idiom appears to be in its origin a colloquialism, one might almost say, a vulgarism, implying a lack of precision in thought and in expression. The speaker at first deems it sufficient to refer to the noun by means of a pronoun or more commonly a pronominal suffix, but recollecting that the hearer may be in doubt as to whom the suffix refers, he adds as an afterthought a clause containing the real name of the person or thing which he has in his mind. The noun being thus expressed twice became emphatic; gradually the idiom began to be used more frequently, and then regularly whenever any

¹ Cf. Driver, *LOT.*, p. 538, No. 39.

stress was to be laid upon a noun, and, in the course of time, even where no emphasis was intended. Being thus essentially a popular construction it may be assumed to have been even more common in the popular dialect of Biblical times¹ than in the literary language, and from the old colloquial Hebrew it descended into MH.

In about forty passages in the Mišna and frequently in the Midrašim circumlocution by של with the appropriate suffix is found in the place of the possessive suffix attached immediately to the noun itself. This construction is used (a) on grounds of grammar where, namely, the noun cannot take the suffix through being indeclinable or consisting of a compound expression, and (b) on grounds of style, where it is desirable to leave the noun unchanged for the sake of lucidity or emphasis.

(a) On grounds of grammar :

1. Compound expressions which form standing phrases and are thus inseparable: *Ma'as. Šeni*, III, 6 (מעשר שני שלהם); *Yoma*, VIII, 6; *Hullin*, II, 7 (חצר-כבר שלו); *Megilla*, IV, 8; *B. Kam.*, VIII, 1; *B. Meš.*, VII, 2; *'Eduy.*, III, 5; *Kerith.*, I, 2 (לא " שלהן"; cf. Lev. iv. 28); *Mekilta*, fol. 28 a, b, 56 a; *Sifra*, fol. 50 a (סימי-טורה שלו).

2. A composite subject: *Šabb.*, VI, 8 (כסא וסמוכות שלו) "his—the lame man's—seat and supports"; *Aboda Z.*, II, 6 (הפת והשמן שלהם).

3. Indeclinable: *Pesah.*, VIII, 5 (בשני שלה, בשמיני שלו); *Beša*, II, 8; *'Eduy.*, III, 12 (ברחים שלהם); especially foreign words: *Kelim*, XIII, 7 (האונקלי שלה = ἀγκύλη); XVI, 7 (קמרון שלה "arched lid"—καμάρα²); XVIII, 2 (מוכני שלה—μυχανή); *Ukšim*, I, 2 (הפיטמא שלהן); *Mekilta*, fol. 26 b, 28 b, 32 a, 42 a (פלטרין שלו—ἐκόν³); 44 a (פלטרין שלו—παλάτιον³).

¹ Note its occurrence in the N. Palestinian documents 1 Kings xix. 21 and xxi. 13; cf. Burney's *Notes on Kings*, p. 209.

² Cf., however, Jastrow, s. v.

³ So Levy and Kohut. Jastrow derives it from πραιτώριον, with the change of ρ into λ.

(b) On grounds of style :

1. With nouns used in a secondary, derived, or figurative sense: *Šebi'ith*, II, 10 החמרות שלהם (of the palm-like flower of the gourd; cf. Bertinoro, ad loc.); *Šabb.*, I, 10 התחתון שלה "its lower part" (תחתונה might have been taken in a different sense); VI, 8 קב שלו "his artificial foot" (not *kab* "a measure"); so *Kelim*, XI, 7; *Yebam.*, VIII, 4 הבצים שלו (*testes*, so *Kelim*, XIX, 8); *Ab. Z.*, II, 3 הקרע שלו "its opening"; *Hullin*, III, 2; *Sifra*, fol. 48 c החוט שלה (viz. of the שדרה "the spinal cord"); האם שלה ("the *matrix*," so *Bekor.*, IV, 4); *Kelim*, XII, 4 עגלה שלה ("the stand of a chest"); XVI, 3 לרחב שלהם ("of the sides of a basket"); *Ohol.*, XI, 8 והפרח שלה ("the calyx of a candlestick"); *Ukṣin*, I, 2 הלבוש שלה ("the vesture" of an ear of corn); so perhaps הסיב שלו (cf. Maimonides, ad loc.); *Sifra*, fol. 75 a האמה שלה ("membrum").

2. Emphatic: *Terum.*, X, 12 אפילו החלמון שלה "even its yoke"; *Kelim*, VII, 2 הצדרין שלו, and below הרחב שלו (viz. of stand mentioned at the beginning of the section; XIII, 6 חותם שלה and חפין שלה (in antithetical cases); so perhaps *Mekilta*, fol. 28 b; *Sifra*, fol. 19 c (שהנשיא שלו).

Cf. the following similar constructions in BH.: Gen. xxiii a לו אשר לו, מערת המכפלה אשר לו, xli. 43; Exod. xxxviii. 30; Lev. ix. 8 ענל החטאת אשר לו (emphatic; cf. v. 15); xvi. 6, 11; Judges iii. 20 (עלית המקרה אשר לו); 1 Sam. xvii. 40; 1 Kings xv. 20 (שרי לו); so || 2 Chron. xvi. 4; 1 Kings xxii. 31 || 2 Chron. xviii. 30; 2 Kings xvi. 13. Further, 1 Sam. xx. 40 (הנער אשר לו), xxv. 7; 2 Sam. xiv. 31; 1 Kings i. 33, iv. 2; Ruth ii. 21 (הנערים אשר לי); Lam. i. 10 (בקהל לך); Ezek. xliii. 14 (והחיק לו?)¹.

So also in late Phoenician (Punic): אמא שלי, הולך שלי, and בני שלי; cf. Schröder, § 69; Wright, *Comp. Gr.*, p. 120.

Vulgar Arabic also uses *betā'* for the possessive suffix but without apparent cause; cf. Spitta, l. c.

In the Assuan Papyri are found, apparently without any emphasis at all, such instances as ברלי = ברא לי = ברי; ברהלי = ברתי; ביתך = ביתא זילך; cf. Cowley's *Introd.*, pp. 9, 17.

¹ Cf. König, *Syntax*, § 281 O, B; Oxford Lexicon, s. v. אשר.

Enough has now been said in the foregoing pages to enable us to answer with a certain degree of confidence the questions with which we set out at the beginning of this inquiry. Our survey of some of the chief features of MH. grammar has revealed the fact that as far as strict grammar is concerned, MH. is *absolutely independent* of Aramaic; that it is identical in the main with BH., and where it differs from the latter the genesis of the differences can generally be traced back to an older stage of the language, out of which the new forms have developed in a *natural* and *methodical* manner. We have met with a considerable number of forms and constructions which are quite unknown in Aramaic. Some of these are found in BH. in isolated cases, and in others it is possible at least to trace their connexion with BH. prototypes; but, what is most important, nearly all of them bear the stamp of *colloquial usage* and of *popular development*, while, on the other hand, not a single trace has been discovered of that artificiality with which the MH. idiom has been commonly credited. In fact, the colloquial and popular character of MH. grammar is so strongly pronounced that it helps us in many cases to distinguish in BH. colloquial or dialectal forms and phrases from the literary and polite ones, a fact which, if elaborated with proper care and discrimination, may have an important bearing upon many problems in Biblical criticism.

Many grammatical phenomena, especially in the realm of syntax, which had been hitherto regarded as peculiar to Aramaic, and the occurrence of which in MH. and also in BH. had been attributed to Aramaic influence, have been shown to be common to all or several of the Semitic dialects in a later phase of their existence, and therefore as indigenous in Hebrew as in any of its sister languages.

No doubt Aramaic did exercise a profound and far-reaching influence upon MH., but this influence was confined to the vocabulary and hardly extended to the grammar at all except indirectly, in so far as the altered

vocabulary and phraseology tended also to modify in some measure the grammatical construction of the language.

The answer, therefore, which grammar has to offer to the question whether MH. was a natural, living, and popular dialect developed gradually and systematically out of old Hebrew, or merely an artificial and mechanical scholastic jargon which masqueraded as a kind of Hebrew but was really a bad Aramaic in disguise, is decidedly and unequivocally in favour of the former alternative, and this answer must be taken to settle the question once and for all. The presence of so many Aramaic words and phrases in MH. can as little affect its genuineness as, for example, the preponderance of the Latin element in the English dictionary can affect the genuine Teutonic character of the English language, or, let it be said, as little as the presence in Aramaic itself of so many Hebrew and other foreign words and phrases can affect the genuine and originally Aramean character of the language of Syria and Mesopotamia. Nay, on a closer examination the MH. vocabulary itself will be found to support strongly the verdict of the grammar. Without entering for the present upon this very desirable examination, it may be stated here that the MH. vocabulary consists of two main divisions each of which has to be subdivided again into three smaller groups, viz. :—

I. Words common to MH. and BH.

1. Words used in MH. in the same connotation and in the same form as in BH.
2. Words used in MH. in the same connotation but in slightly altered form, often approaching or similar to Aramaic usage.
3. Words used in MH. in a different connotation often agreeing with Aramaic usage.

II. Words found in MH. but not in BH.

1. Words peculiar to MH., not found in Aramaic, or only as MH. loan-words, but often found in other Semitic languages.

2. Words common to MH. and to Aramaic, either as originally common Semitic or North Semitic words, or as loan-words in both dialects from foreign languages, notably Assyrian, Iranian, and the classical languages, or as mutual loan-words in MH. and Aramaic.

3. Words borrowed by MH. from Aramaic.

It will be seen that Aramaic influence comes in only in group II. 3 and, to some extent, in groups I. 2, 3, while group I. 1, and especially group II. 1, a considerable proportion of which consists of words connected with the arts and crafts and other occupations of everyday life, can only be reasonably accounted for by the assumption that Hebrew continued to be a living medium of speech up to, and including, the MH. period. Group II. 2 includes a large number of words in which priority may be claimed by either dialect, but in the case of words connected with the religious and ethical aspects of life the presumption will generally have to be in favour of MH. It cannot be repeated too often that the vocabulary of the Old Testament contains but a part, and possibly only a small part, of the stock of words possessed by the Hebrew language. It is, therefore, unreasonable to assign to Aramaic all such words in MH. which are not found in BH.¹ As a matter of fact the much-talked-of Aramaic influence upon post-exilic BH. was comparatively insignificant even in the sphere of vocabulary², and much more insignificant in the sphere of grammar. Many of the so-called grammatical Aramaisms in the Old Testament are nothing but colloquial or dialectal, but none the less genuine Hebraic, forms which generally turn up again as the normal types in MH., as we have often had occasion to point out in the preceding pages. For both in respect of grammar as well as in respect of

¹ As is done by S. Mannes in his dissertation *Über d. Einfluss d. Aram. auf den Wortschatz d. Mišnah* (Berlin, 1897). In spite of all his partiality for Aramaic, he has only succeeded in collecting 176 instances of Aramaic words under the letters ס—נ.

² Cf. Kautzsch, *Aramaismen im AT.*, p. 102 f.

vocabulary, the Hebrew Scriptures offer us but a fragmentary and incomplete presentation of what the living language actually was at various periods of its existence, a presentation, however, which can often be supplemented and completed by MH.

MOSES H. SEGAL.